

AUTONOMY AND INTIMACY IN MARRIAGE:
AN EXPLORATORY AND EXEMPLARY STUDY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Ph.D. degree

School of Theology at Claremont

by

Charles Ray Akin, Jr.

June 1977

This dissertation, written by

Charles Ray Akin, Jr.

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Faculty Committee

Allen Mauer
Chairman

Stephen C. Johnson

Ronald E. Osborn

Frank W. Timpson

Date April 21, 1977

George O. Haughey

DEDICATION

for Jan...

Love one another, but make not a bond of love:
Let it rather be a moving sea between the shores of your
souls.
Fill each other's cup but drink not from one cup.
Give one another of your bread but eat not from the same
loaf.
Sing and dance together and be joyous, but let each one of
you be alone,
Even as the strings of a lute are alone though they quiver
with the same music.

---Khalil Gibran, The Prophet

Attraction can flare up in almost any situation, but love cannot long endure where there are no selves, no terminals between which the spark can alternate. Anode and cathode, yang and yin, riposte, counterpoint, tension: it is just that simple. "I will demand of thee, and answer thou me." The first two times this challenge was flung down, it was God who said it to Job. The third time, Job turned himself and said it to the Lord. From that point, he was released from his miserable trap. One fancies that God smiled.

---Michael Drury, Advice to a
Young Wife from an Old
Mistress

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | xii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. PURPOSE | 1 |
| 1. Statement of the Purpose | 2 |
| 2. Statement of the Problem | 2 |
| 3. Reasons for the Study | 3 |
| 4. Importance of the Study | 4 |
| 5. Limitations of the Study | 6 |
| B. INITIAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS | 6 |
| 1. Autonomy | 6 |
| 2. Intimacy | 7 |
| 3. Marital Relationship | 8 |
| C. REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE | 8 |
| D. METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY | 12 |
| 1. Grounded Theory Research | 13 |
| 2. Theological and Psychological Theory | 13 |
| 3. Data-Gathering Methodology | 15 |
| E. ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION | 22 |
| II. THEORY | 23 |
| A. INTRODUCTION | 23 |
| B. PAUL TILLICH: A DIALECTICAL AND ONTO-LOGICAL APPROACH | 24 |
| 1. The Life Process | 24 |
| 2. The Function of Self-Integration | 24 |
| 3. Individualization and Participation | 25 |
| 4. The Principle of Centeredness | 26 |
| 5. Self-Awareness | 27 |
| 6. Morality | 27 |
| 7. Agape | 28 |
| 8. The Function of Self-Creation | 29 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| 9. Subject-Object | 29 |
| 10. The Spiritual Presence | 30 |
| 11. The Function of Self-Transcendence . | 31 |
| 12. Freedom and Destiny | 31 |
| 13. The Principle of Sublimity | 33 |
| 14. The Dimension of Spirit | 34 |
| 15. The New Being | 36 |
| 16. Relatedness | 37 |
| C. HERBERT W. RICHARDSON: A LIFE-AFFIRMING EVOLUTIONARY APPROACH | 39 |
| 1. The Hypostases of Unity | 39 |
| 2. The Presence of God | 40 |
| 3. The Gift of Sanctification | 42 |
| 4. The Stage of Self-Consciousness . . | 43 |
| 5. The State of Polyconsciousness . . . | 45 |
| D. ERIK H. ERIKSON: A DEVELOPMENTAL, PSYCHOSOCIAL APPROACH | 46 |
| 1. Basic Trust versus Basic Mistrust . | 47 |
| 2. Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt . | 49 |
| 3. Initiative versus Guilt | 50 |
| 4. Industry versus Inferiority | 52 |
| 5. Identity versus Identity Diffusion . | 53 |
| 6. Intimacy versus Isolation | 54 |
| 7. In Summary | 55 |
| E. FREDERICK S. PERLS: A DYNAMIC, EXPERI- ENTIAL APPROACH | 56 |
| 1. Contact-Boundary | 56 |
| 2. Contact and Withdrawal | 58 |
| 3. Autonomy | 60 |
| 4. Response-ability | 61 |
| 5. Confluence | 62 |
| 6. In Continuing Relationships | 64 |
| 7. Process and Awareness | 66 |
| 8. In Conclusion | 66 |
| F. NORMATIVE DEFINITIONS OF TERMS | 67 |
| 1. Autonomy | 68 |
| 2. Intimacy | 71 |
| 3. The Normative Definition of Autonomy | 75 |
| 4. The Normative Definition of Intimacy | 76 |
| G. SUMMARY | 76 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN THE GATHERING OF DATA | 78 |
| A. INTRODUCTION | 78 |
| B. OBTAINING A GROUP OF COUPLES FROM WHOM SUBJECT COUPLES COULD BE SELECTED . . . | 78 |
| C. ANALYZING OF DATA AND SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT OF PROVISIONAL CLASSIFICATORY CATEGORIES | 81 |
| D. SELECTION OF SIX COUPLES TO BE INTERVIEWED | 83 |
| E. MEANS OF INTERVIEWING THE SUBJECT COUPLES | 84 |
| F. SUMMARY | 85 |
| IV. THE COUPLES | 86 |
| A. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION | 86 |
| B. THE SIX COUPLES | 86 |
| 1. Couple One | 87 |
| 2. Couple Two | 96 |
| 3. Couple Three | 105 |
| 4. Couple Four | 115 |
| 5. Couple Five | 123 |
| 6. Couple Six | 131 |
| C. SUMMARY | 139 |
| V. FINDINGS | 140 |
| A. VALIDITY OF PROVISIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS . | 140 |
| 1. Autonomy | 140 |
| 2. Intimacy | 143 |
| 3. Analysis of Data | 147 |
| B. PRESENTATION OF MODIFIED CLASSIFICATIONS | 150 |
| C. THE "HIGH-HIGH" MARRIAGE EXEMPLIFIED . . . | 152 |
| D. THE "HIGH-HIGH" MARRIAGE CONTRASTED . . . | 162 |
| E. SUMMARY | 167 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| VI. CONCLUSIONS | 169 |
| A. GENERATION OF HYPOTHESES | 169 |
| B. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 176 |
| C. SUMMARY | 177 |
| D. POSTSCRIPT | 178 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 179 |
| APPENDICES | 186 |

ABSTRACTAUTONOMY AND INTIMACY IN MARRIAGE:
AN EXPLORATORY AND EXEMPLARY STUDY

Charles Ray Akin, Jr., Ph.D.
School of Theology at Claremont

1977

Purpose. Previous researchers have assumed that autonomy and intimacy tend to be mutually exclusive factors and have attempted to demonstrate which of the two is essential for marital satisfaction. This dissertation seeks to establish the existence of a marital relationship in which autonomy and intimacy exist together, to exemplify such a marriage, to contrast the autonomous/intimate marriage with other types of marriage, and to generate issues for further research.

Procedure. The writings of two theologians, Paul Tillich and Herbert W. Richardson, and two psychologists, Erik H. Erikson and Frederick S. Perls, were used in the construction of the following definitions of autonomy and intimacy:

Autonomy refers to the combined qualities of self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction and to the placing of a high value upon the self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction of others. It is characterized by the awareness of oneself as trustworthy, the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint, the experiencing of growth, the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to society, the absence of despair, and a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness. Autonomy does not imply nonconformity as an end in itself, nor does it connote the avoidance of responsibilities and obligations.

Intimacy refers to an occurrence in a growing relationship between two autonomous persons who regard one another as equals. Intimacy is characterized by each

person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship." It includes warm mutual regard, deep friendship, and mutual cherishing. Persons who experience intimacy also experience a transcendent quality in the relationship. An intimate relationship ordinarily has a history; it does not simply leap into existence. Persons who experience intimacy in their relationship tend to consider themselves accountable to one another and seek to understand one another more and more fully.

Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory was administered to thirty-one married couples as a means of ascertaining potential subjects' probable levels of autonomy and intimacy. On the basis of selected POI scores, six couples were chosen for depth interviewing.

Interview transcripts were examined to ascertain whether the couples interviewed conformed to the study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy. It was established that two of the couples exemplified autonomy and intimacy in their marriage and that three of the other marriages could serve as "contrasting couples."

Findings. The marriages characterized by high levels of autonomy on the part of both spouses and a high degree of intimacy are exemplified as reporting a high degree of satisfaction with their marriage, placing high premiums upon the achievement of sexual satisfaction and upon sexual fidelity, structuring their relationships in relatively traditional ways, husbands' talking with their wives about their work, members describing their work outside the home

as being stressful, exhibiting a marked ability to adjust to changes in their lives, having developed effective means of conflict resolution, each partner's tending to think positively of self as spouse, expressing no reservation as to whether they would remarry each other "if they had it to do all over again," desiring not to want to alter their marriages, and describing their religious beliefs in similar terms.

Conclusions. The study concludes that the highly autonomous/highly intimate marriage does exist and that it can be a source of a high degree of satisfaction. The study generates several hypotheses and raises several questions for further research.

PREFACE

It is not easy to do empirical research on theological issues. Theology has been defined as "the articulation of faith."¹ Theology must speak of universals, and it must do so in terms that are subtle and filled with nuances, many of which cannot be comprehended in ordinary or in research language. Research, on the other hand, is most reliable when it deals with "oversimplif[ied] reality":

The dilemma of the scientist is to select models that are at the same time simple enough to permit him to think with the aid of the model but also sufficiently realistic that the simplifications required do not lead to predictions that are highly inaccurate. The more complex the model, the more difficult it becomes to decide exactly which modifications to make and which new variables to introduce. Put simply, the basic dilemma faced in all sciences is that of how much to oversimplify reality.²

The researcher, or scientist, must operationalize³ theories in order to study them, and much is inevitably

¹John B. Cobb, Jr., Theology and Pastoral Care (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), p. xi.

²Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Causal Inferences in Non-experimental Research (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), p. 8.

³Although the most recent edition of Webster's unabridged dictionary does not define the verb operationalize, it does define operationalism as "the view that the concepts or terms used in nonanalytic scientific statements must be definable in terms of identifiable and repeatable operations," and operation as "a doing or performing of a practical work or of something involving practical application of principles or processes" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged [Springfield, MA: Merriam, 1968]).

lost in the translation from the language of theory into the language of research. Hubert Blalock states that "an inherent gap" exists between theoretical and operational languages, and adds, "There appears to be no purely logical way of bridging the gap between these languages."⁴

Blalock describes the process of research as including the selection of "a finite number" of specified variables, to which, once they are selected, the researcher is committed.⁵

Having thus committed ourselves to a particular set of variables, we in effect admit that had another set been selected, our model might have looked quite different. In other words, there is nothing absolute about any particular model, nor is it true that if two models make use of different variables, either one or the other must in some sense be "wrong."⁶

The larger the number of variables the researcher selects, the simpler must be his or her assumptions about how the variables are interrelated.⁷ It follows that research, the results of which are most believable, is that research which includes the fewest number of variables. Yet, theory--especially theological and philosophical theory--is filled with variables. The complex nature of theology, then, mitigates against its becoming operationalized.

A further difficulty is involved in doing empirical research on theological issues. Theology tends to be

⁴Blalock, p. 6.

⁵Ibid., p. 15.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 21.

expressed causally, yet "causality can never be proved beyond all doubt no matter what the nature of one's empirical evidence."⁸ Empirical research can only prove correlation. It can establish that Y follows X, but night follows day and yet night is not caused by day. The relationship between night and day is empirically perceived as correlational; it cannot be established as causal; no relationship can be conclusively proven to be causal.

One admits that causal thinking belongs completely on the theoretical level and that causal laws can never be demonstrated empirically. But this does not mean that it is not helpful to think causally and to develop causal models that have implications that are indirectly testable. In working with these models it will be necessary to make use of a whole series of untestable simplifying assumptions, so that even when a given model yields correct empirical predictions, this does not mean that its correctness can be demonstrated.⁹

Empirical researchers persisting in their determination to study theological issues must confront the problem of methodology. F. S. C. Northrup suggests that there are three stages of logical inquiry.¹⁰ In the first stage of inquiry the problem is analyzed. The second stage's task

⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹⁰F. S. C. Northrup, The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities (Cleveland: World, 1959), Chs. I-IV. Northrup conceives logic to include "any form of knowing in religion and art as well as the sciences proper. Thus the Oriental method of immediate apprehension, close to aesthetic sensitivity, which the experts in Oriental ways of knowing call the method of intuition, is here treated as falling under logic. This intimately relates logic to art, to culture and to the humanities generally, including religion," p. viii.

is the inspection of relevant facts designated by the first stage's analysis. Three methods are, as a rule, involved: observation, description, and classification.¹¹ The third stage features the formulation of deductive theory.¹²

Northrup's stages would appear to be especially helpful to the empirical theologian. Theological theory can be understood as similar to Northrup's first stage: it serves for the analysis of the problem; it enables the conceptualization of the problem. The researcher can proceed from theological analysis to a systematic and disciplined process of observation, description, and classification. It is to be expected that much--but not all--of the richness of the theological analysis will be lost in this process, but the theoretical will have been rendered operational and the formulation of theory enabled.

This is the methodology followed in this dissertation. It is called "grounded theory."¹³

I am grateful to Allen Moore for his steadfast encouragement to me in my research endeavors and for his patient and seminal collaboration with me in the designing of this study. I appreciate Steve Iman for his incisive

¹¹Ibid., p. 35.

¹²Ibid., p. 59.

¹³See Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

grasp of methodology, for his accessibility, and for his openness. Frank Kimper and Patricia Martin Doyle introduced me to working correlationally with theology and psychology and imparted to me something of their enthusiasm for cerebration. Ronald Osborn graciously served on my committee and lent support.

My friend Alan Cole was in California briefly at exactly the right time to make a suggestion about design that unblocked a research logjam. Allan Wicker and Gerry Jordan were free with their scholarly resources. Jean Cobb worked with me in tracking down books and dissertations.

I am grateful to the ten Whittier ministers who sent me names of potential subject couples, to the thirty-one couples who took part in the research project, and particularly to the six couples who became subjects and shared themselves with me in depth.

I am glad for David and Kim, my children, with whom I look forward to becoming better acquainted now that "Daddy's tissertation" is finished.

I am particularly glad for Jan, my research associate, my typist, and my wife.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

In her capacity as wedding hostess for the church to which we belong, my wife reports that in some weddings the bride and the groom are each given lighted candles from which they together then light a third candle. The lighting of the third candle is intended to represent the beginning of a new reality: a marriage. What gives me pause is that, in many cases, after having lighted the third candle, the bride and the groom blow out their two separate candles! This candle-snuffing ritual can be taken to mean that the two persons being married no longer have lives of their own, that their separate "fires" are henceforth subsumed and consumed by the new marital relationship into which the bride and groom have entered.

This dissertation is based upon my conviction that some intimate marital relationships can be enhanced by both partners' leading portions of their lives that are separate from one another. The dissertation will make a case for the viability of brides' and grooms' continuing to light third candles, and for their keeping the first two candles lighted as well.

1. Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to derive, from selected theological and psychological sources, definitions of autonomy and intimacy that will be used normatively for this study; to utilize case descriptive material in exemplifying marriages of persons who have high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy and in contrasting such marriages with other types of marriages; and to generate issues for further research.

2. Statement of the Problem

Focusing on what he terms "the issue of separateness and connectedness," John W. Ried comments that writers tend to view marriage primarily in terms either of the separateness aspect or in terms of connectedness. Ried himself takes a position in favor of connectedness:

The writer has also seen that husbands and wives wanting to share with each other seems to be associated with good marital adjustment, husbands and wives wanting to do their own thing, apart from the other, is associated with poor marital adjustment.¹

This quotation illustrates the marked tendency of contemporary writers to give primacy in the marital relationship

¹John Wallace Ried, "Affiliation and Autonomy Needs as Related to Marital Adjustment of Forty-Three Couples in Central Massachusetts" (Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1974), p. 3.

either to autonomy or to intimacy.²

The present study takes an inclusive approach to separateness and connectedness, or autonomy and intimacy, seeking to establish the importance of both--rather than the subordination of either aspect--within a marital relationship.

3. Reasons for the Study

Several reasons for the study may be given. My own experience as a husband has demonstrated my personal needs for both autonomy and intimacy and has given direction to my search for a model of marriage in which both aspects exist. My practice as a marriage counselor/pastoral counselor has brought to my attention many persons who experience pain because their marriages lack either autonomy or intimacy.

Church publications have tended to emphasize togetherness or unity as the ideal married state, a condition in which a sense of autonomy or self-sufficiency is undesirable:

Physically and spiritually you can give yourselves to each other until "the two shall become one." This does not mean that you give up your own personality, but that the two personalities are blended in such a manner as to achieve a sense of unity. Unity comes as each

²See, as examples, Howard J. and Charlotte H. Clinebell, The Intimate Marriage (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), and Nena and George O'Neill, Open Marriage (New York: Evans, 1972).

supplies what the other has not. [Italics mine]³

[The marriage covenant is] their whole life in common, by living and acting as a single unit, until they are two in one flesh.⁴

A major ingredient in the struggle of churches creatively to come to grips with a new model for a marital relationship can be attributed to the fact that "the church and the larger society have not recognized the female as an equal partner alongside the male."⁵

The writings of several eminent theologians and psychologists suggest that an inclusive model of marriage can be inferred, although it has not yet been explicitly developed.⁶

4. Importance of the Study

The stress under which the nuclear family and

3To Love and to Cherish: the Marriage Manual of the United Methodist Church (Nashville: Methodist Pub. House, 1970), p. 15.

4Rev. Eugene McAlee, C.S.S.R., S.S.L., in Rev. James T. McHugh (ed.) Working Papers in the Theology of Marriage (Washington: Family Life Bureau, 1967), p. 6. The publication bears the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington.

5James H. Olthuis, I Pledge You My Troth (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), p. 15. As sources, Olthuis cites John T. Noonan, Contraception (New York: Mentor, 1965) and Roland H. Bainton, Sex, Love, and Marriage (London: Fontana, 1958).

6The theologians and psychologists I will cite below under Methodology: Theological and Psychological Theory (p. 14) are examples.

especially the marital dyad exist in contemporary American society has been thoroughly documented.⁷ This study is intended to offer a resource to couples and to counseling professionals in their efforts at maintaining and enriching contemporary marriages and persons.

Further, by exemplifying and providing bases for a model of a marital relationship which holds the two issues

⁷See Arlene S. and Jerome H. Skolnick, Family in Transition: Rethinking Marriage, Sexuality, Child Rearing, and Family Organization (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), esp. pp. 90-144, 179-99; this social-scientific study "challenges an ideology of the nuclear family which implies that there is only one best way for people to live their lives" (p. viii). See also Arlo D. Compaan, "A Study of Contemporary Young Adult Marital Styles as Found Among a Select Sample of Church-Related Couples" (Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, School of Theology at Claremont, 1973), pp. 85-103; this source gives an historical survey of theoretical research bearing upon contemporary marriage. The titles of the following books reflect, in themselves, the issue: Lawrence Casler, Is Marriage Necessary? (New York: Human Sciences Press, 1974) and Kathrin Perutz, Marriage Is Hell (New York: Morrow, 1972).

A major U.S. denomination recently addressed itself to the issues as follows:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the General Assembly of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) meeting in San Antonio, Texas, August 15-20, 1975, lift up ministry to and with families as a recognized need of the church; and . . . develop a comprehensive and concentrated program of family ministries designed to help prevent breakdown of families, heal divided families, and support and strengthen the family life. [Yearbook and Directory of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), (Indianapolis: General Office of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), 1976)]

of autonomy and intimacy in creative tension--rather than rejecting or deemphasizing either--this study is intended to clarify and inform churches' understandings of marriage and programmatic efforts more adequately to minister to contemporary marriages.

5. Limitations of the Study

The study is exploratory and exemplary. It uses selected theological and psychological sources in its theory section. It utilizes as representative cases heterosexual couples residing in Southern California who have been formally married for at least three years. It does not attempt to quantify its findings.

B. INITIAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Because normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy will be developed in Chapter II, the definitions that are given here are intended to be provisional, "working" definitions.

1. Autonomy

In this study autonomy refers to the combined qualities of independence, self-support, and self-direction and to the placing of a high value upon the independence, self-support, and self-direction of others. It is characterized by the awareness of oneself as trustworthy, the determination to exercise free choice as well as

self-restraint, the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to society, and by a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness.

As it is used in this study, autonomy does not imply nonconformity as an end in itself, nor does it connote the avoidance of responsibilities and obligations.⁸

2. Intimacy

In this study intimacy refers to an occurrence in the relationship between two persons that is characterized by each person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship."⁹ It includes warm mutual regard, deep friendship, and mutual cherishing.

An intimate relationship ordinarily has a history; it does not simply leap into existence. Persons who experience intimacy in their relationship tend to consider themselves accountable to one another and seek to understand

⁸Cf. Allen L. Edwards, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (New York: Psychological Corp., 1959), p. 11; which is based upon the system of needs developed in H. A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938).

⁹Thomas C. Oden, Game Free: the Meaning of Intimacy (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 3.

one another more and more fully.¹⁰

3. Marital Relationship

For the purpose of this study, marital relationship is used to designate a relationship in which a man and a woman are formally, legally married to one another.

C. REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE

No research has been conducted that studies marriages in which both spouses exhibit high levels of personal autonomy and in which a high degree of intimacy has been actualized. The research project which most nearly studied such marriages was conducted by John W. Ried in 1974.¹¹ Ried focussed upon the spouse-specific needs of affiliation and autonomy as they related to marital adjustment. Ried, as did many researchers before him, adopted the terms affiliation and autonomy from H. A. Murray's theory of personality.¹² Although Murray did not specifically define affiliation and autonomy, he did so "characterize" these

¹⁰Specific behavioral modes of expressing intimacy--such as genital sexual expression--are not included in these definitions in order to maximize what the study can discover about how intimacy is expressed.

¹¹Ried.

¹²H.A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938). Edwards, is an example of an instrument based upon Murray's theory and characterizations of needs.

needs, that Ried developed, for his own research purposes, the following paraphrases of Murray's characterization of affiliation:

"I give myself utterly to the happiness of my wife."

"If possible, I have my wife with me wherever I go."

"I am desperately unhappy if I am separated from my wife."

"I enjoy cooperating with my wife more than working by myself."

The following paraphrases of Murray's characterization of autonomy were prepared by Ried:

"I am unable to do my best work when I am in a subservient position to my wife."

"I go my own way regardless of the opinions of my wife."

"I disregard the rules and regulations of my wife that hamper my freedom."

"I demand independence and liberty from my wife above everything."

It can readily be seen that Murray/Ried set up affiliation and autonomy as contradictory categories--affiliation appearing to connote a quality of "togetherness" in which neither spouse has identity or happiness apart from the other, and autonomy appearing to connote a control or dominance factor that would make spouses long not to be in one another's presence.

It should come as no surprise that Ried found that affiliation was positively correllated with marital adjustment and that autonomy was negatively correllated. Since

his study allowed for no consideration of the mutually advantageous interplay of the need to be alone and the need to be with one's spouse, it is difficult to imagine that he could have reached any other conclusion.

Support for the defining of autonomy in a manner that is contrary to that of Murray and Ried is offered by William Kurtines¹³ who--after remarking that most psychological theories of moral conduct are concerned with the determinants of compliance, and noting that, unlike compliance, autonomy is difficult to operationalize--asked five psychologists and five graduate psychology students to use a Q-sort to describe the autonomous individual. The procedure was repeated with ten non-psychologists and a profile of those items most characteristic of the autonomous individual was prepared. It included self-reliance, efficiency, persistency, the deriving of personal reward from one's work, and the tendency to take stands on issues. The profile also included those items least characteristic of the autonomous individual: suggestibility, conformity, submissiveness toward authority, concern with making a good impression, and inability to make quick decisions.

Two efforts should be mentioned that have produced definitions of intimacy that are consonant with this

¹³William Kurtines, "Autonomy: a Concept Revisited," Journal of Personality Assessment, XXXVIII: 3 (June 1974) 243-46.

study's. Alan Dahms has contributed a study of intimacy¹⁴ in which he constructs an "intimacy hierarchy" in the form of a pyramid with three interrelated levels. The lowest level is called "intellectual," the middle level is termed "physical," and the highest level is named "emotional." Emotional intimacy is characterized by mutual accessibility, naturalness, nonpossessiveness, and process. Dahms' book makes a case for the need for intimacy and suggests that a non-competitive, more intimate lifestyle is on the horizon for people.

Commenting that "there is no definitive study of intimacy available in any language,"¹⁵ Thomas C. Oden solicited groups of persons to recall in fantasy or imagination an experience of satisfying intimacy and then to write down their fantasy using clear, descriptive language. From a study of this material, Oden developed the following definition of intimacy:

Intimacy is an intensely personal relationship of sustained closeness in which the intimus sphere of each partner is affectionately known and beheld by the other through congruent, empathic understanding, mutual accountability, and contextual negotiability, durable in time, subject to ecstatic intensification, emotively

¹⁴Alan M. Dahms, Emotional Intimacy: Overlooked Requirement for Survival (Boulder, CO: Pruett, 1972). The book includes an annotated bibliography which draws upon many disciplines, including philosophy, psychology, sociology, theology, adult and children's fiction, autobiography, and communication theory.

¹⁵Oden, p. 5.

warm and conflict-capable, self-disclosing and distance-respecting, subject to death and yet in the form of hope reaching beyond death.¹⁶

Oden's definition of intimacy makes reference to "distance-respecting," thereby anticipating the possibility that autonomy and intimacy can be complementary rather than antagonistic. The work of Oden has been helpful in the preparation of this study's provisional definition of intimacy.

The field of family sociology thus far has not produced a typology of the highly autonomous-highly intimate marriage, although several other typologies have been developed.¹⁷

The lack of research in the area of study addressed by this dissertation underscores the need for an exploratory approach to the subject.

D. METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY

Because virtually no research has been undertaken that focusses upon the interrelationship of autonomy and intimacy, a modified grounded theory approach to the study will be employed. The grounded theory approach will be

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 24-25.

¹⁷See, for example, John F. Cuber and Perry B. Harroff, "Five Types of Marriage," in Arlene S. and Jerome H. Skolnick (eds.) Intimacy, Family, and Society (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), pp. 313-25.

augmented by use of selected theological and psychological sources to provide definitions and conceptual frameworks.

1. Grounded Theory Research

Grounded theory has been developed as a research approach by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss who stress that data can be used to generate hypotheses:

Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research. Generating a theory involves a process of research.¹⁸

In the doing of grounded theory research, it is important precisely not to pre-set one's hypotheses but rather to "maintain a sensitivity to all possible theoretical relevances. . . ."¹⁹

Because grounded theory is concerned to generate rather than to verify hypotheses, statistical tests of significance are not ordinarily employed.²⁰

Grounded theory research will underlie the entire process of the study and will be elaborated upon in the sections immediately following.

2. Theological and Psychological Theory

The first step of the study will involve

¹⁸Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Strategies for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine, 1970), p. 6.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 194.

²⁰Ibid., p. 200.

establishing what selected theologians and psychologists have written on the subject of the interrelationship of autonomy and intimacy, especially as that interrelationship applies to a marital relationship. Four theorists have been selected, each of whose thinking has contributed toward this author's understanding of the research problem.²¹ Paul Tillich has been selected because he systematically explicates the relationship between what he terms individualization and participation, and between freedom and destiny, and because of his advocacy of dialogue between theology and psychology. Herbert W. Richardson's selection is based upon the uniqueness of his cultural and historical emphases and upon the originality of his approach to the subject of unity. Erik H. Erikson has been selected because of the eminence of his developmental and psychosocial approaches and because of his explicit treatment of both autonomy and

²¹The fact that selected theorists are being used in this study is not intended to suggest that only the theorists selected can contribute helpfully to the conceptualizing of the issues. Neo-Whiteheadian thought in particular has addressed itself to the issues. Cobb describes Christian love as implying "no merger of self and other" and as imposing no demand upon the one loved: "lover and loved retain their full personal, responsible autonomy." John B. Cobb, Jr., The Structure of Christian Existence (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), p. 137. Williams writes of the necessity of preserving one's individuality in a love relationship: "each brings to the relationship an originality which belongs to him alone and each finds in the other an originality which belongs to that other alone." Daniel Day Williams, The Spirit and the Forms of Love (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 114.

intimacy. Frederick S. Perls' selection is based upon his concern for contact, withdrawal, and confluence, and upon his emphases upon process and the present moment.

In keeping with the precepts of grounded theory, the theory section will be concluded by the adjusting of the provisional definitions of autonomy and intimacy so that normative definitions are derived from material selected from the writings of the four theorists.

3. Data-Gathering Methodology

Data will be gathered through a series of steps that include administration of a personality test to a large number of possible subjects, selection of subjects upon the basis of their test scores, depth interviewing of subjects, and analyzation of interview transcripts. Two of the methodologies to be employed--the personality test that will be used and the methodology of the depth interview--will be discussed in this section.

a. The Personal Orientation Inventory [POI] is the personality test that has been selected for administration to a large number of possible subjects as a means of ascertaining potential subjects' probable levels of personal

autonomy and capacities for intimacy.²²

Developed by Everett L. Shostrom in 1963,

the POI consists of 150 two-choice comparative-value-judgment items reflecting values and behavior seen to be of importance in the development of the self-actualizing individual.²³

Respondents are asked to select the one statement in each pair of statements that is most nearly true of him- or herself. Two major scales and ten subscales are utilized in comparing respondents' scores to those of normative samples. The scales are clinically derived and include the major scale Support Ratio (inner-directed/other-directed ratio) along with its component Inner-Directed Percentile which "defines relative autonomy by assessing a balance between other-directedness and inner-directedness."²⁴ A subscale appearing to be relevant to this study is termed Capacity for Intimate Contact about which Shostrom has written,

A high score measures the person's ability to develop meaningful, contactful, relationships with other human

²²It is not assumed that the POI's definitions of autonomy and intimacy fully correspond to this study's definitions. The POI's definitions, while they are as nearly in harmony with this study's definitions as are the definitions utilized by any other personality test, are more briefly stated and present fewer dimensions and characteristics than do this study's definitions. Chapter V will begin with a validation procedure designed to establish whether POI-selected subjects are indeed autonomous and intimate in accordance with this study's normative definitions.

²³Robert R. Knapp, Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory (San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1976), p. 2.

²⁴Ibid.

beings. A low score means one has difficulty with warm inter-personal relationships.²⁵

The POI is the only reliable, validated personality test this researcher could locate that appears to measure both autonomy and intimacy, and to do so out of a self-actualizing rather than a pathology-oriented theoretical stance: Shostrom cites Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers as having contributed greatly to the theoretical structure from which the POI was constructed.²⁶

Many studies have undertaken to demonstrate the validity and reliability of the POI. In 1964 Shostrom demonstrated that the POI

significantly differentiated a sample of clinically nominated, self-actualizing individuals from a sample nominated as nonactualizing. This study provided important initial evidence for the validity of the POI in that the Inventory was shown to discriminate between individuals who have been observed in their life behavior as having attained a relatively high degree of actualizing, and those individuals who do not evidence such development.²⁷

²⁵Everett L. Shostrom, Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory (San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1974), p. 18.

²⁶Ibid., p. 4. References cited by Maslow are Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper & Row, 1954); Toward a Psychology of Being (New York: Van Nostrand, 1962); and The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York: Viking, 1971). References cited by Rogers are Client-Centered Therapy (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1951) and On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1961).

²⁷Knapp, p. 9. The study appeared as "An Inventory for the Measurement of Self-Actualization," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIV (1964), 207-18.

Evidence of POI validity in measuring self-actualization among "normal" persons was reported by E. W. McClain in 1970.²⁸ Thirty guidance counselors enrolled in a summer institute were rated as to how self-actualizing they were by staff members. Ratings were highly reliable: the mean correlation among raters was .77; the highest positive correlation between the ratings and the POI scores was .69 (the Inner-Directed rating); this figure is significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. The Capacity for Intimate Contact correlation was .42, significant beyond the .05 level.

The test-retest reliability of the POI was studied by R. E. Klavetter and R. E. Mogar who administered the instrument twice to forty-eight college students. An interval of one week occurred between administrations. Correlations ranged between .52 and .82.²⁹ R. L. Ilardi and W. T. May administered the instrument to forty-six student nurses with a one-year interval between administrations and reported coefficients ranging from .32 to .74.³⁰ This

²⁸E. W. McClain, "Further Validation of the Personal Orientation Inventory," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXV:2 (1970), 21-22.

²⁹R. E. Klavetter and R. E. Mogar, "Stability and Internal Consistency of a Measure of Self-Actualization," Psychological Reports, XXI (August-December 1967), 422-24.

³⁰R. L. Ilardi and W. T. May, "A Reliability Study of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, VIII:1 (Spring 1968), 68-72.

information is especially noteworthy in the light of the fact that the POI measures dynamic traits that could be expected to vary over a time interval in response to subjects' experiences.

b. Depth Interviewing is the method to be used in gathering data from the subjects. Jacqueline Wiseman and Marcia Aron, who refer to the depth interview as "an exploratory tool,"³¹ "a fishing expedition,"³² and useful in developing categories and hypotheses,³³ add, "It can also become an end in itself--that is, a way to get detailed descriptions or even explanations of certain types of social behavior.³⁴

In the depth interview, the interviewer usually begins with very general questions, phrased in tones that are as neutral as possible, then gradually focusses the interview more and more upon subjects of interest to the interviewer. A typical depth interview is one and one-half hours in length.³⁵

The depth interview will be utilized because it is highly flexible, and maximizes the possibility of obtaining

³¹ Jacqueline P. Wiseman and Marcia S. Aron, Field Projects in Sociology for Sociology Students (Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1970), p. 42.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 43. ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42. ³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 44, 45, 48.

unanticipated information. Further, it appears to be the best means of gathering data in sufficient detail to satisfy the exploratory, grounded theory approach of this study.

It is expected that some difficulty will be encountered in organizing the material. For the purposes of this research, however, it is preferable to have too much material rather than too little.

In addition to basic biographical and informational questions, the following questions will be asked as beginning points for various aspects of the depth interview:

What is it like to live with your husband/wife? Would you describe a typical day of your marriage to me?

Do you and your husband/wife ever have differences of opinion? Why do you suppose that is? [If the interviewee has acknowledged having differences of opinion]: How do you handle the differences?

Is it okay ever to feel angry at your husband/wife? Is there any [other] way that it's not okay to feel toward your husband/wife?

How do the two of you deal with financial matters? How are decisions made about major purchases?

Has your marriage changed over the years? Has your husband/wife changed? Have you changed?

How frequently would you estimate that the two of you have sexual intercourse? Are you satisfied with this aspect of your marriage?

How does your marriage compare with your parents' marriage?

Would you describe your marriage as being happy? Why do you suppose that is?

Would you like to change anything about your marriage?

How would you describe a good husband? How would you

describe a good wife? [interviewee to be asked about own role last]

If you had it to do all over again, do you think you'd marry [your spouse]?

Why do you suppose I chose you to be interviewed?

At the conclusion of the depth interview, a brief word-association projective test will be given. An assumption underlying the use of projective techniques is that,

since perception is selective and idiosyncratic--that is, since each person perceives the world differently because of biological, psychological, and cultural factors--it is assumed that the structure he imposes or 'projects' on to the material is a reflection of his inner state.³⁶

The interviewee will be told that he or she will hear several words. Without stopping to consider a response, the interviewee is to say whatever word comes to mind immediately after hearing each word spoken by the interviewer.

The words to be used are:

togetherness

loneliness

intimacy

autonomy

separateness

friendship

sex

husband [to be said first to men, second to women]

wife [to be said first to women, second to men]

breadwinner [first to men, second to women]

homemaker [first to women, second to men]

After the interviewee has responded to the list of words, s/he will be told that the interviewer will read the list

³⁶Ibid., p. 162.

again, and that s/he should give a value response--Positive, Negative, or Neutral--to each word.

Further information pertaining to methodology employed in data gathering will be contained in Chapter III of this study.

E. ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter Two will present theoretical statements from the works of Tillich, Richardson, Erikson, and Perls and will conclude with normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy.

Chapter Three will present a comprehensive statement of the methodologies and procedures followed in the gathering of data for the study.

Chapter Four will present the study's raw data: the subject couples. The chapter will consist not of transcripts of interviews, but of information gleaned from the interviews as means of depicting the couples.

Chapter Five will present the study's findings: the validity of provisional classifications of subjects, the presentation of couples who exemplify highly autonomous and highly intimate marriages, and the contrasting of these couples with other couples studied.

Chapter Six will draw conclusions from the findings, will draft hypotheses regarding highly autonomous and highly intimate marriages and will raise questions for further study.

CHAPTER II

THEORY

A. INTRODUCTION

In order to study autonomy and intimacy it is necessary to build a theoretical framework within which the terms can be understood. This chapter will offer theological and psychological perspectives from the writings of Paul Tillich, Herbert W. Richardson, Erik H. Erikson, and Frederick S. Perls. These perspectives may be expected to clarify which critical variables are included in the terms autonomy and intimacy.¹ In Chapter Six, the material developed in Chapter Two will be utilized for the purposes of dialogue with the study's findings. This dialogue should produce conclusions, hypotheses, and questions for further research.

¹The theological perspectives are intended to do more than provide a basis for the derivation of this study's normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy. They present a more complete perspective than can be empirically stated or tested, but that nevertheless offers a framework for conceptualizing and, perhaps, actualizing a uniquely pastoral understanding of psycho- and socio-dynamics out of which the practice of pastoral counseling is conducted.

B. PAUL TILLICH:

A DIALECTICAL AND ONTOLOGICAL APPROACH

1. The Life Process

Paul Tillich has defined life as "the process in which potential being becomes actual being."² Inherent in this definition is the conception of a movement from a center of action, a movement which "takes place in such a way that the center is not lost in the outgoing movement."³ Potentiality becomes actuality through the following elements in the life process: self-identity, self-alteration, and return to one's self.⁴

2. The Function of Self-Integration

Life has three functions, each characterized by a direction, a principle, and a set of ontological polarities. The first function is that of self-integration: its direction is circular, its principle is centeredness and its polarities are individualization and participation.⁵ Through this function the center of self-identity is

²Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951-63), I, 242.

³Ibid., III, 30. ⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., III, 32. The second function is self-creation, its direction is horizontal, its principle is growth, its polarities dynamics and form; the third function is self-transcendence, its direction is vertical, its principle is sublimity and its polarities freedom and destiny.

established, caused to experience self-alteration, then re-established with those new contents which have resulted from the alteration.⁶

3. Individualization and Participation

Like the other sets of ontological polarities in Tillich's system, individualization and participation are interrelated in such a way that "each pole has meaning only as it refers by implication to the opposite pole."⁷ Individualization's perfect form is called a person; the perfect form of participation is called communion. Communion can be experienced only with persons. The relationship between the polarities is illustrated as follows:

Communion is participation in another completely centered and completely individual self. In this sense communion is not something an individual might or might not have. Participation is essential for the individual, not accidental. No individual exists without participation, and no personal being exists without communal being.⁸

Tillich further elaborates that individuals discover themselves through responding to the resistance of other persons:

In the resistance of the other person the person is born. Therefore, there is no person without an encounter with other persons. Persons can grow only in the communion of personal encounter. Individualization and participation are interdependent on all levels of being.⁹

⁶Ibid., III, 35.

⁷Ibid., I, 165.

⁸Ibid., I, 176.

⁹Ibid., I, 177.

Tillich acknowledges that polarities do not merely complement each other; under the condition of finitude, tension exists as polarities tend to move away from each other. Individualization threatens to move toward a quality of loneliness; participation can move toward collectivization.

Man as finite is anxiously aware of this twofold threat. Anxiously he experiences the trend from possible loneliness to collectivity and from possible collectivity to loneliness. He oscillates anxiously between individualization and participation, aware of the fact that he ceases to be if one of the poles is lost, for the loss of either pole means the loss of both.¹⁰

The tension between the poles does not, however, lead necessarily to a break.¹¹ Rather, through spirit they are (fragmentarily) united and made creative.¹² Indeed, used symbolically, individualization and participation describe God as "the ground of everything personal" and at the same time "the principle of participation"--neither term being applicable apart from the other.¹³

4. The Principle of Centeredness

A fully individualized being is fully centered. One's center is an indivisible point of direction for the outgoing and returning movement between self-alteration and self-identity. Where there is a center there is also a

¹⁰Ibid., I, 199.

¹¹Ibid., I, 202.

¹²Ibid., I, 251.

¹³Ibid., I, 244-45.

periphery which includes those elements of which the center is the center. This periphery corresponds to participation in the same way that the center corresponds to individualization. The more centered one is, the more one also has a periphery. Therefore, the more one is individualized, the greater is that person's capacity for participation: "He can participate in the universe in all its dimensions and draw elements of it into himself."¹⁴

5. Self-Awareness

The decisive step in the self-integration of life is self-awareness: the fact that "all encounters of a being with its environment are experienced as related to the individual being that is aware of them."¹⁵ The center of a self-aware being is the psychological self.¹⁶

6. Morality

In the moral act persons actualize their essential centeredness.

A moral act . . . is not an act in which some divine or human law is obeyed but an act in which life integrates itself in the dimension of spirit, and this means as personality within a community. Morality is the function of life in which the centered self constitutes itself as a person; it is the totality of those acts in which a potentially personal life process becomes an actual person.¹⁷

¹⁴Ibid., III, 33. ¹⁵Ibid., III, 36.

¹⁶Ibid., III, 37. ¹⁷Ibid., III, 38.

The moral imperative is experienced as the encounter with another self whose "claim to be a person and to be dealt with as a person"¹⁸ is an absolute limit upon the self's attempt to assimilate all content. Only within a community of centered selves is personal self-integration actualized as the result of the continued experience of otherness, of the moral imperative.¹⁹ The community itself, however, is not centered. It consists of centered individuals; it lacks, itself, a centered self.²⁰

7. Agape

One does not abstractly encounter another person.

The moral imperative demands that one self participate in the center of the other self and consequently accept his particularities even if there is no convergence between the two individuals as individuals.²¹

This sort of acceptance-by-participation is concrete expression of agape, the "ultimate norm of the moral law"²² and "the source of moral motivation":

What ought to be and what is are identical in the state of potentiality. In existence, this identity is broken. . . . Therefore, obedience and disobedience are mixed; the law has the power to motivate partial fulfillment, but in so doing it also drives to resistance, because by its very character as law it confirms our separation from the state of fulfillment. It produces hostility against God, man, and one's self.²³

¹⁸Ibid., III, 40. ¹⁹Ibid., III, 40-41.

²⁰Ibid., III, 41. ²¹Ibid., III, 45.

²²Ibid., III, 45-56. ²³Ibid., III, 48-49.

Agape is the object of persons' search for that morality which transcends the law, "reuniting and integrating reality."²⁴ Through agape the moral law is accepted as "the expression of what man essentially or by creation is"²⁵ and transcended as "commandment and threat."²⁶ Love is neither an emotion nor a law but rather a reality, a matter of being, through which the person's existential and essential beings are reunited.²⁷ Love is given by the Spiritual Presence, not created by a person's will: it is grace.

8. The Function of Self-Creation

As the first function of life, the function of self-integration, describes the centered self, so the second function, self-creation, gives the impetus which moves the self from one centered state to another.²⁸ Self-creation's principle is growth, corresponding to self-integration's principle of centeredness.²⁹

9. Subject-Object

Self-creation operates always under "the ambiguity of self-determination": one cannot bring about one's own fulfillment, yet a self determined by others would not be a

²⁴Ibid., III, 50. ²⁵Ibid., III, 272.

²⁶Ibid. ²⁷Ibid., III, 272-73.

²⁸Ibid., III, 51. ²⁹Ibid., III, 52.

self but rather a thing.³⁰ Relationships are subject to the ambiguities of personal growth and personal participation. One cannot help another person to grow without at the same time working toward depersonalizing the individual one seeks to help. "Trying to enhance a subject as subject makes it into an object."³¹

Participation, sought for, turns into self-seclusion after the experience of rejection, real or imagined. The innumerable mixtures of hostility and surrender are some of the most conspicuous examples of the ambiguity of life.³²

The most crucial consideration is the subject-object phenomenon: so long as a person is treated as an object that person is depersonalized.

10. The Spiritual Presence

The ambiguity of self-determination, the split of the self into a subject that controls and an object that is controlled is overcome by the Spiritual Presence which brings reunion to the previously split self.³³ The ambiguity of personal participation, the quest for reunion with another person, is overcome when both persons discover that they are grasped by a reality that transcends them both:

Neither surrender nor subjection are [sic] adequate means of reaching the other one. He cannot be reached

³⁰Ibid., III, 75. ³¹Ibid., III, 76.

³²Ibid., III, 77. ³³Ibid., III, 260.

directly at all. He can be reached only through that which elevates him above his self-relatedness. . . . Only through the impact of the Spiritual Presence is the shell of self-seclusion pierced. The stranger who is an estranged part of one's self has ceased to be a stranger when he is experienced as coming from the same ground as one's self.³⁴

11. The Function of Self-Transcendence

Life's third function, that of self-transcendence, follows from the functions of self-integration and self-creation and its vertical direction ("toward ultimate and infinite being") transcends the circular and horizontal directions of the first two functions.³⁵

12. Freedom and Destiny

The polarity of freedom and destiny "transcends the essential necessity of being without destroying it."³⁶ Persons experience freedom only so long as they also experience destiny.

Freedom refers to the freedom of the person, not to the freedom of a function of the person.

One should speak of the freedom of man, indicating that every part and every function which constitutes man a personal self participates in his freedom. This includes even the cells of his body, in so far as they participate in the constitution of his personal center.³⁷

Freedom is experienced as deliberation (weighing . . . acts

³⁴Ibid., III, 261-62. ³⁵Ibid., III, 86.

³⁶Ibid., I, 182. ³⁷Ibid., I, 183.

and motives"³⁸), decision (cutting off possibilities), and responsibility which

points to the obligation of the person who has freedom to respond if he is questioned about his decisions. He cannot ask any one else to answer for him. He alone must respond, for his acts are determined neither by something outside him nor by any part of him but by the centered totality of his being.³⁹

Destiny is the basis out of which persons make decisions and includes

body structure, psychic strivings, spiritual character . . . , the communities to which I belong, the past unre-membered and remembered, the environment which has shaped me, the world which has made me. . . . , all my former decisions.⁴⁰

Just as destiny is the basis out of which persons express their freedom, so freedom is involved in the shaping of destiny. Destiny limits and conditions freedom and includes an eschatological dimension.

Freedom does not exist apart from destiny. Conversely, "Only he who has freedom has a destiny."⁴¹

Under the conditions of finitude persons experience tension between freedom and destiny. The necessities implied in one's destiny threaten one's freedom; the contingencies implied in one's freedom threaten one's destiny.⁴² Finite beings experience threat, tension and anxiety; it is

³⁸Ibid., I, 184.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Ibid., I, 185.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid., I, 200.

impossible to be finite and not experience these feelings. Threat, however, is not actuality and "Jesus as the Christ" is a model of "a human life in which all forms of anxiety are present but in which all forms of despair are absent."⁴³

The polarity of freedom and destiny can be applied to God in the sense that God is free of dependence upon persons and that God is God's own destiny. "In God freedom and destiny are one."⁴⁴

When a person attempts to separate her- or himself from God--God being the source of the relationship between freedom and destiny--that person ceases to have either freedom or destiny. Freedom becomes arbitrariness and contingency and destiny becomes mechanical necessity.⁴⁵ This leads to despair which can be overcome only through the Spiritual Presence.

13. The Principle of Sublimity

In some ways, to be aware of oneself means to be beyond one's self⁴⁶ and to participate ambiguously in greatness,⁴⁷ but under the dimension of the spirit in which "the great reveals its dependence on its relation to the ultimate, and with this awareness the great becomes holy."⁴⁸

⁴³Ibid., I, 201.

⁴⁴Ibid., I, 248-49.

⁴⁵Ibid., II, 62-63.

⁴⁶Ibid., III, 91.

⁴⁷Ibid., III, 89.

⁴⁸Ibid., III, 94.

Indeed, under the dimension of the spirit life is sublime--whether in the moral act of integration, the cultural act of creation or the religious act of transcendence.⁴⁹

Religion has its ambiguities, however, just as do morality and culture. Among religion's ambiguities are self-transcendence and profanization in the religious function itself and the demonic elevation of something conditional to unconditional validity.⁵⁰

The basic ambiguity of religion has a deeper root than any of the other ambiguities of life, for religion is the point at which the answer to the quest for the unambiguous is received. Religion in this respect . . . is unambiguous; the actual reception, however, is profoundly ambiguous, for it occurs in the changing forms of man's moral and cultural existence.⁵¹

In religion persons begin the search for life that is unambiguous. The answer comes through--though it is not identical with--religion.⁵²

14. The Dimension of Spirit

The answer comes to persons through the dimension of spirit, defined by Tillich as "the actualization of power and meaning in unity."⁵³ The experience of this actualization is a part of what it means to be human and enables us ecstatically to experience the Spiritual

⁴⁹Ibid., III, 96. ⁵⁰Ibid., III, 98.

⁵¹Ibid., III, 104. ⁵²Ibid., III, 107.

⁵³Ibid., III, 111.

Presence as a breaking through into our own spirits in such a way that our spirits are neither destroyed, disrupted, nor torn out of their states of centeredness--thus creating unambiguous life, a unity of ecstasy with structure.⁵⁴ An example of ecstasy is that prayer in which the person who prays is aware of self and neighbor as being under the influence of the Spiritual Presence and so speaks "to the God who prays to himself through us."⁵⁵

The content of the manifestation of God's Spirit in the human spirit may be described as faith, "the state of being grasped by the transcendent unity of unambiguous life," and love, "the state of being taken into that transcendent unity."⁵⁶

In the religion of the Old Testament it is not possible to separate the experience of the Spiritual Presence from the experience of humanity and justice, thus integrating into the ecstatic experience both personality and community.⁵⁷ Christianity defines the divine Spirit as the Spirit of Jesus as the Christ and, in his image, understands the Spiritual Community to be created ecstatically through faith, existing through a love expressed in service especially to those in need, yearning for the reunion of

⁵⁴Ibid., III, 112-16.

⁵⁵Ibid., III, 119-20,192.

⁵⁶Ibid., III, 129.

⁵⁷Ibid., III, 143-44.

all persons, open to all individuals and groups.⁵⁸ In the Spiritual Community the three functions of life coexist in unity under the dimension of spirit--unambiguously and fragmentarily.⁵⁹

15. The New Being

In Jesus as the Christ the New Being encounters and overcomes the forces of estrangement precisely through his participation in human finitude.⁶⁰ His is "a personal life which is subjected to all the consequences of existential estrangement but wherein estrangement is conquered in himself and a permanent union is kept with God."⁶¹

Such negativities as anxiety and despair are not removed but instead, through the reality of the New Being, are taken into participation in the ground of being. "Free participation" characterizes the New Being. Persons are called to participate in the New Being, accept it, and be transformed by it.⁶²

The New Being responds with regeneration to persons who, in faith and love, are receptive. Regeneration is participation in the New Being; it brings rebirth.⁶³

The New Being responds with justification,

⁵⁸Ibid., III, 151-52.

⁵⁹Ibid., III, 157-61.

⁶⁰Ibid., II, 135.

⁶¹Ibid., II, 135.

⁶²Ibid., II, 176.

⁶³Ibid., III, 222.

acceptance by God as not estranged of those who are indeed estranged, to the paradoxical qualities of faith and love. Through justification persons are made that which they essentially are and from which they are estranged. Persons must courageously accept that they are unacceptable to God, that they cannot by any means make themselves acceptable to God, and that God accepts them.⁶⁴

The New Being responds with sanctification to the anticipatory qualities of faith and love. Sanctification is the life process by which the power of the New Being transforms persons and communities. It includes the principles of increasing awareness, increasing freedom, increasing relatedness, and increasing transcendence. One becomes increasingly aware of one's inner ambiguities, that one is both demonic and divine.⁶⁵ One becomes increasingly free from "the commanding form of the law."⁶⁶ Balancing the fact of growing freedom, one becomes increasingly related.

Relatedness implies the awareness of the other one and the freedom to relate to him by overcoming self-seclusion within oneself and within the other one.⁶⁷

16. Relatedness

Tillich has some crucial things to say about mature

⁶⁴Ibid., III, 224-25.

⁶⁵Ibid., III, 228-32.

⁶⁶Ibid., III, 232.

⁶⁷Ibid., III, 233.

relatedness. Relatedness cannot be actualized horizontally (i.e., between persons) without the inclusion of the vertical, the Spiritual, dimension. Only the Spiritual Presence can lift the person above him- or herself so that that person can truly find another person (provided that person also is willing to be elevated above him- or herself). The test of one's ability to relate is one's capacity for solitude.

All human relations have this character. Alone, they cannot conquer loneliness, self-seclusion, and hostility. Only a relation which is inherent in all other relations, and which can even exist without them, is able to do so. Sanctification, or the process toward Spiritual maturity, conquers loneliness by providing for solitude and communion in interdependence.⁶⁸

It is proper and important to speak of mature self-relatedness as well--a state in which the individual can affirm self essentially as beyond both subject and object, thus producing heightened self-affirmation and spontaneity.⁶⁹

Increasing self-transcendence is expressed through a quality of devotional life through which "the transcendence becomes more definite and its expressions more indefinite."⁷⁰

⁶⁸Ibid., III, 234.

⁶⁹Ibid., III, 235.

⁷⁰Ibid., III, 236.

C. HERBERT W. RICHARDSON:
A LIFE-AFFIRMING, EVOLUTIONARY APPROACH

Herbert W. Richardson's contributions to the subject under discussion are theological, historical and sociological. This presentation will treat each of these emphases.

1. The Hypostases of Unity

Richardson defines being as a quality of oneness constituting the identity of things.⁷¹ He asserts that we can refer to the unity of everything that exists under the three forms or "hypostases" of (1) individuality (the unity of an individual), (2) relationality (the unity of two or more individuals), and (3) wholeness (the unity of all relationships).⁷² He is careful to point out that the unity of relationality does not subsume the individuals whom it relates. Rather, they each retain their distinctiveness since the relation is "an object in its own right."⁷³

Richardson proceeds to deduce that

every unity . . . is as real as any other unity. This means not only that each individual is . . . as real as

⁷¹Herbert W. Richardson, Toward an American Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 81.

⁷²Ibid., p. 82.

⁷³Ibid., p. 83.

any other individual, but that any individual is as real as any relation or any whole, including the Whole which encompasses all things.⁷⁴

Richardson bases this conclusion upon his central tenet that "the characteristic of reality is unity, and it is as real to be an individual as it is to be a whole."⁷⁵

Further, individuals do not derive their identity from relationality or from the Whole:

Individuals have their being in the Whole, but from themselves; for individuality does not originate in, nor derive from wholeness, nor the reverse. Wholeness, individuality, and relationality are therefore three distinct hypostases of unity. As such, each is capable of being the principle of an individual system of categories.⁷⁶

Richardson argues for what he calls "the unity of the unities," a reality that transcends the categories.⁷⁷ This unity is present in all things: "each is one, and oneness is fully in each, and yet oneness is fully in all."⁷⁸ God, the Transcendent One, is this unity.

2. The Presence of God

Richardson proposes that holiness be defined neither as essence ("an attribute of God's nature") nor as

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 84. It should be noted that, whereas Richardson's insistence upon the separateness of individuality and relationality stands in contrast with Tillich's polar relationship of individualization and participation, the result of both theologians' emphases is to prevent either autonomy or intimacy from being subsumed in the other, thereby assuring the existence of each.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 101.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 102.

existence ("God's very being"), but as dignity (kabod, glory): the heaviness, weightiness, of God which is the basis of authority, tragedy and meaning--and is not communicable.⁷⁹ It follows that, where there is holiness, God personally is present.

Correspondingly, Richardson constructs a Sabbath-centered theology, defining the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit of the Sabbath" who sanctifies all things.⁸⁰ The Puritan Sabbath is celebrated by Richardson as grounded in the order of creation (the seventh day being the culmination of the first six days) and qualitatively different from other days. Sabbath rest is not to be understood primarily as abstention from work but as "the revelation of the highest dimension of reality," the establishment of God's holiness in the world as the highest joy of all creation.⁸¹ As such, the Sabbath, the creation of the seventh day, has dominion over persons, the creations of the sixth day, just as persons have dominion over other created things. The Sabbath is the occasion for enjoying God's

personally enter[ing] the world and dwell[ing] therein. The mere time and space of the Sabbath is the formal and material precondition for God's personal coming. By his personal coming God sanctifies the Sabbath.⁸²

The message of the Sabbath then is one of the importance of

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 123.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 113.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 117.

⁸²Ibid., p. 126.

life as it is. A person is not lifted into transcendent unity; God bestows his presence, his holiness, upon the world.

3. The Gift of Sanctification

Sanctification becomes the chief purpose of the incarnation. Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, comes because he wants to be here.

He is not here for the sake of something else. The presence of the Holy One in our midst is its own sufficient reason. Nothing exceeds this, for this gives human life its dignity, worth, and importance.⁸³

Only, argues Richardson, after we know Jesus as "God with us," as friend, can we know him as "God for us," as redeemer.

This is the Sabbath vision of American Christianity: that Jesus Christ, "God with us," is intrinsically so holy and attractive that we would love Him for Himself alone even if He were not also our Redeemer.⁸⁴

Redemption becomes a subordinate, though essential, purpose for Christ's coming: only that which has already been established as worthy is a fit object for redemption.⁸⁵ Jesus is God in person, by nature fully God and fully man, affirmed in the World Council of Churches' original basis: "Jesus Christ is God and Savior."⁸⁶

Out of love for persons, Jesus Christ sends the

⁸³Ibid., p. 130.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 131.

⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 131-32. ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 141.

Holy Spirit (who indwells and is united with Christ) to unite us. "The Holy Spirit is an uncreated person who unites in Himself both another divine person and a human person."⁸⁷ The Spirit unites us mystically with Christ and with each other, insuring by being present in us that God's personal holiness is with us.⁸⁸ The Spirit is, in fact, God in person, sent by God for the purpose of God's being present in us (the message of the incarnation) as well as with us (the message of the Sabbath).⁸⁹ The Spirit sanctifies us, making us holy--not through ourselves but because the Spirit is in us--extending God's presence with persons beyond the Sabbath and foreshadowing the eschaton.⁹⁰

4. The Stage of Self-Consciousness

Richardson has constructed a set of four stages in the evolution of human consciousness through the course of history.⁹¹ He believes that the process of historical evolution must somehow be appropriated in each person's psychological development.⁹² The third stage, called "self-consciousness," emerged between 1300 and 1700 A.D. and produced "the new social institution of romantic marriage"⁹³

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 147.

⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 142, 148.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 153.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 154-55.

⁹¹Herbert W. Richardson, Nun, Witch, Playmate: The Americanization of Sex (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 15.

⁹²Ibid., pp. 16-17.

⁹³Ibid., p. 67.

in which individuality and intimacy are encouraged:

What happens in a society that accepts [romantic] love as the foundation for marriage and the family? There will be a strong impetus in the direction of individualism within all social structures. But it also means that the essential purpose of marriage will be to allow two persons to share their own unique relation. . . .⁹⁴

The full equality of men and women is established and a non-authoritarian style of marital and family living is created. "Everyone can now be friends."⁹⁵ Sexual desire is desire, not for personal orgasm or release from tension, but rather for sharing and communion, "an expression of deepest friendship."⁹⁶ Richardson uses communion, sharing, and intimacy interchangeably:

Yet personal communion requires the capacity of persons to open themselves to each other and to reveal the uniqueness of themselves as persons. This opening creates a unique intimacy. . . . It exists not as a giving nor as a receiving, but as a perfect sharing. It takes co-initiative and co-responsiveness.⁹⁷

Only a person who has a sense of his or her own identity can experience intimacy. This identity or uniqueness lies beyond social roles, beyond conforming to the other's expectations, beyond sexual roles. It requires a high degree of self-awareness.

People can perceive in others only what they also experience in themselves. All interpersonal experience involves the projection of the form of one's own sense of selfhood upon others. . . . Only a person who

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 68-69. ⁹⁵Ibid., p. 82.

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 106-107. ⁹⁷Ibid., p. 112.

experiences himself as unique can perceive the uniqueness of others.⁹⁸

5. The State of Polyconsciousness

The basis of personal identity and autonomy is "the development of self-confidence, or fidelity."⁹⁹ The fourth stage of human consciousness, which Richardson calls "polyconsciousness," is today beginning to emerge.¹⁰⁰ It is a further step, built upon the preceding stages of consciousness. Though the form of the emerging stage is as yet vague, Richardson states that it enables persons to share themselves with several other persons without being threatened, "a consciousness that is able to bear a greater multiplicity in unity."¹⁰¹ Polyconsciousness will involve the unification of previously-emerged values through "some new organizing vision."¹⁰² It will produce the "integral," self-conscious person who has a secure sense of identity and self-sufficiency. This person experiences transcendence as an inner demand to grow to full potentiality and self-sufficiency. Such a person is not, however, more isolated from others--rather, that autonomous person experiences a new possibility for community, a set of relationships freely chosen, each upon the basis of what the other

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 114.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 123.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 137.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 138.

"really is in himself rather than simply for what he is that correlates with my own needs."¹⁰³

D. ERIK H. ERIKSON:

A DEVELOPMENTAL, PSYCHOSOCIAL APPROACH

Erik H. Erikson has formulated a set of eight stages in the psychosocial development of the individual.¹⁰⁴ Each stage is ascendant for a particular period of time in the individual's life and builds upon those stages which have preceded it. The crisis inherent in each stage calls for an integration of all preceding stages of growth and foreshadows the integration of succeeding stages as well.¹⁰⁵ The process is life-long, featuring the individual's living through a particular stage, resolving the crisis belonging to that stage, integrating the learnings that emerge out of the resolution of that crisis with learnings achieved from having resolved earlier stages' crises, then moving into the next life-stage which features its own crisis to be resolved, experiences to be absorbed, and learnings to be integrated.

¹⁰³Herbert W. Richardson, "Three Myths of Transcendence," in his Transcendence (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 112.

¹⁰⁴Erik H. Erikson, Identity and the Life Cycle (New York: International Universities Press, 1959), pp. 50-100.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 53.

The first six of Erikson's stages feature the following sequence of crises: basic trust versus basic mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, identity versus role confusion, intimacy versus isolation. An explication of the interrelationship between these crises and the stages to which they belong will now be presented.

1. Basic Trust versus Basic Mistrust

Erikson's first stage, occupying approximately the first fifteen months of life, centers around the psycho-social crisis "basic trust versus basic mistrust."¹⁰⁶ Psychosexually, this stage is usually referred to as the "oral" stage.¹⁰⁷ Erikson understands the oral zone to be "only the focus of a first and general mode of approach, namely incorporation."¹⁰⁸

The optimum total situation implied in the baby's readiness to get what is given is his mutual regulation with a mother who will permit him to develop and co-ordinate his means of getting as she develops and co-ordinates her means of giving.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 54-56.

¹⁰⁷See, as basic reference on psychosexuality, Sigmund Freud, "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality," in his The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (London: Hogarth Press, 1953), VII, 125-244.

¹⁰⁸Erik H. Erikson, Childhood and Society (2d ed.; New York: Norton, 1963), p. 72.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 75-76.

As the infant moves into the second half of the first stage, teeth begin to develop and the paradoxical fact emerges that the pain of teething can only be alleviated by biting harder. Erikson terms the mode of approach of this sub-stage "incorporation by biting,"¹¹⁰ and has written,

Where breast feeding lasts into the biting stage (and, all in all, this has been the rule on earth) it is now necessary to learn how to continue sucking without biting, so that the mother may not withdraw the nipple in pain or anger. Our clinical work indicates that this point in the individual's early history can be the origin of an evil dividedness, where anger against the gnawing teeth, and anger against the withdrawing mother, and anger with one's impotent anger all lead to a forceful experience of sadistic and masochistic confusion leaving the general impression that once upon a time one destroyed one's unity with a maternal matrix. This earliest catastrophe in the individual's relation to himself and to the world is probably the ontogenetic contribution to the biblical saga of paradise, where the first people on earth forfeited forever the right to pluck without effort what had been put at their disposal; they bit into the forbidden apple, and made God angry.¹¹¹

The stage can be characterized by the terms "to get" and "to take" and, by association, "to give in return"--this last term referring somewhat mystically to one's relationship with one's mother, the primary "giver" during this stage.¹¹²

Resolution of the crisis of the first stage in such a manner that the individual experiences a greater measure of trust than of mistrust enables that person to

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 78.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 79.

¹¹²Erikson, Identity, pp. 58-60.

acquire the virtue of hope, "the enduring belief in the attainability of fervent wishes, in spite of the dark urges and rages which mark the beginning of existence."¹¹³

2. Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt

Erikson's second stage of psychosocial development extends approximately through the third year of life and centers around the crisis "autonomy versus shame and doubt."¹¹⁴ It is a time in which the child begins to coordinate her or his abilities to hold onto and to let go of things. Psychosexually speaking, the primary bodily zone is that of the anus, although the urethra and one's general muscular structure are also involved.¹¹⁵ The significant persons in the child's life are his or her parental persons as, in response to the praise they give and the limits they set, the child complexly works out how much control the child will retain over the functions of her or his body. Traditionally the time of toilet training, the second stage results in the child's attaining some measure of autonomy and (hopefully) a lesser measure of shame and doubt. Such a resolution of the second stage's crisis is dependent upon

¹¹³Erik H. Erikson, Insight and Responsibility (New York: Norton, 1964), p. 118.

¹¹⁴Erikson, Identity, pp. 65-74.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 66.

there having a favorable resolution¹¹⁶ of the crisis of the first stage: "The infant must come to feel that his basic trust in himself and in the world . . . will not be jeopardized by this sudden violent wish to have a choice. . . .

."¹¹⁷ Out of the favorable resolution of the second stage's crisis emerges the virtue of will, "the unbroken determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint, in spite of the unavoidable experience of shame and doubt in infancy."¹¹⁸

3. Initiative versus Guilt

The psychosocial crisis of Erikson's third stage is "initiative versus guilt."¹¹⁹ The stage begins near the end of the child's third year and extends into the beginnings of the child's school years.¹²⁰ Modalities of the stage are "making" and "being on the make," or, more . . .

¹¹⁶A psychosocial crisis is considered to have been favorably resolved when the individual has acquired a greater measure of the first or positive sense (i.e., basic trust, autonomy) than he or she has acquired of the second or negative sense (basic mistrust, shame and doubt). See *Ibid.*, p. 61, ftn.

¹¹⁷Erikson, Childhood, p. 85.

¹¹⁸Erikson, Insight, p. 119.

¹¹⁹Erikson, Identity, pp. 74-82.

¹²⁰Erikson, Childhood, pp. 85, 258.

technically, intrusion and inclusion.¹²¹ This is the age of sexual differentiation in which the child attains a definite acceptance of his maleness or her femaleness and arrives at some balance between intrusive and inclusive behavior that corresponds to his or her sexual self-awareness.¹²² The primary body zones are those of the genitals and the locomotor muscles.¹²³

It is during this stage that the Superego emerges in response to the Oedipal struggle that involves sexually cathecting the parent of the opposite sex, negatively cathecting one's own-sex parent, then repressing the negative cathexis in favor of identification with one's own-sex parent and vicarious enjoyment of sexual intimacy with the parent of the opposite sex. One's own ego is bruised with the realization that, for all of one's growth and emerging initiative, one cannot sexually compete with one of one's parents for the other of one's parents.¹²⁴

¹²¹Ibid., pp. 87-90.

¹²²It would be inaccurate to imply that one must be entirely intrusive if one is to be fully male or that one must be entirely including or incorporative if one is to be fully female. Even in his early writings Erikson stressed the importance of each sex's participating in and identifying with the social modality dominant for the other sex. See *ibid.*, pp. 93-94.

¹²³Erikson, Identity, p. 166.

¹²⁴Ibid., p. 77.

The Oedipal crisis, in combination with the child's increasing capacity for locomotor, environment-affecting behavior, produces

a deep sense of guilt--a strange sense, for it forever seems to imply that the individual has committed crimes and deeds which, after all, were not only not committed but also would have been biologically quite impossible.¹²⁵

A favorable resolution of the crisis of the third stage enables the individual to acquire the vital virtue of purpose: "the courage to envisage and pursue valued goals uninhibited by the defeat of infantile fantasies, by guilt and by the foiling fear of punishment."¹²⁶

4. Industry versus Inferiority

The linkage between the third and fourth stages is demonstrated by Erikson's comment:

Infantile sexuality lacks any chance of competence. . . . It makes sense, then, that a period of psychosexual latency should permit the human to develop the tool possibilities of body, mind, and thing-world and to postpone further progress along sexual and sensual lines until they become part of a larger area of social responsibility.¹²⁷

Erikson's fourth stage begins after the child has entered school and extends until the onset of puberty. Its

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 79.

¹²⁶Erikson, Insight, p. 122.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 123.

psychosocial crisis is "industry versus inferiority."¹²⁸ Sometimes referred to as the latency period since the child's overt interest in genital expressions of sexuality is dormant, the period is a time of settling down to work. One learns to "do one's duty," to produce, to complete. No violent upheaval occurs during this period. Socially, however, the period is decisive in that it involves working with others and is the time a child first begins to understand what is meant by the term "division of labor."¹²⁹

The virtue acquired by a favorable resolution of the fourth stage's crisis is competence, "the free exercise of dexterity and intelligence in the completion of tasks, unimpaired by infantile inferiority."¹³⁰

5. Identity versus Identity Diffusion

Erikson's fifth stage is that of adolescence and features the crisis "identity versus identity diffusion."¹³¹ It is the first post-childhood stage, the stage of youth. It is the gateway to fully-functioning genitality. In what he calls "basic American," Erikson states, "In youth you find out what you care to do and who you care to be--even

¹²⁸Erikson, Identity, pp. 82-88.

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 88.

¹³⁰Ibid., p. 124.

¹³¹Ibid., pp. 88-94.

in changing roles."¹³²

The fifth stage builds quite clearly upon the four previous stages in that one already has a tempered sense of the basic trustworthiness of persons, of one's autonomy, of one's ability to make a contribution to society. Upon this ontogenetic basis one begins to fashion her or his sense of identity, searching for ideologies to which one can give one's emerging fidelity--the virtue of the stage. Erikson defines fidelity as "the ability to sustain loyalties freely pledged in spite of the inevitable contradictions of value systems."¹³³

6. Intimacy versus Isolation

Erikson has recently demonstrated something of the epigenetic linkage between the fifth and sixth stages by describing youth as a time of "ideological experimentation," then elaborating upon the adult task of "ethical consolidation":¹³⁴

Only in early adulthood can we avow systematic values which seem to be confirmed in daily practice and in concrete competency.

The adult pole of our ethical nature, then, is an affirmative, because more informed and experienced, sense of what one human being owes to another. . . .¹³⁵

¹³²Erik H. Erikson, Dimensions of a New Identity (New York: Norton, 1974), p. 124.

¹³³Erikson, Insight, p. 125.

¹³⁴Erik H. Erikson, Life History and the Historical Moment (New York: Norton, 1975), pp. 206-07.

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 262.

Erikson's sixth stage, that of young adulthood, features the crisis "intimacy versus isolation."¹³⁶ The virtue of the sixth stage is love: "mutuality of devotion forever subduing the antagonisms inherent in divided function."¹³⁷ During the sixth stage "you learn whom you care to be with. . . ."¹³⁸

It is precisely upon the measure of identity and uniqueness that one has established during adolescence that one's capacity for intimacy depends: "only two uniquely different beings can enhance their respective uniqueness for one another."¹³⁹ Only persons who feel reasonably secure in their own identities will consent to run the risk of ego loss that is involved in true intimacy--and it is such persons, daring to risk ego loss, who discover heightened senses of their individual identities as they participate in joint intimacy.¹⁴⁰

7. In Summary

We may follow a person through the first four psychosocial stages by citing Erikson's own formulations of the identity one may gain from favorably resolving the

¹³⁶Erikson, Childhood, pp. 263-66.

¹³⁷Erikson, Insight, p. 129.

¹³⁸Erikson, Dimensions, p. 124.

¹³⁹Erikson, Insight, p. 234.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 128.

crisis of each stage:

Stage I: "I am what hope I have and give."
 Stage II: "I am what I can will freely.
 Stage III: "I am what I can imagine I will be."
 Stage IV: "I am what I can learn to make work."¹⁴¹

Upon these preliminary formulations of one's identity it is possible to construct, during adolescence, a vital and continuing self-definition that will not be lost but rather will become heightened through adult participation in an intimate relationship.¹⁴²

E. FREDERICK S. PERLS:

A DYNAMIC, EXPERIENTIAL APPROACH

The writings of Frederick S. Perls develop several concepts that contribute materially to the preparation of a model of a marital relationship in which autonomy and intimacy are interrelated. These concepts include the contact-boundary, contact and withdrawal, autonomy, responsibility, confluence, process and awareness.

1. Contact-Boundary

Perls conceptualizes the individual as existing at

¹⁴¹Erik H. Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: Norton, 1968), pp. 106, 114, 122, 127.

¹⁴²Erikson's final two stages, which include the crises "generativity versus stagnation" and "integrity versus despair" and result, through successful resolution of their crises, in the virtues care and wisdom (Erikson, Childhood, pp. 266-69, and Erikson, Insight, pp. 131, 133), produce the fruits of intimacy and mature personhood.

every moment in an environmental field.¹⁴³ Of prime concern is the study of what takes place at the contact-boundary between the individual and his or her environment.

The contact-boundary, where experience occurs, does not separate the organism and its environment; rather it limits the organism, contains and protects it, and at the same time it touches the environment.¹⁴⁴

Emphasis is placed upon the mutuality of the relationship between organism and environment. The organism and the environment together form a total system.¹⁴⁵

Meeting one's needs requires becoming clear about where one's boundary is. Perls describes the contact-boundary as "essentially the organ of a particular relation of the organism and the environment."¹⁴⁶ Only when one experiences sharp contrast between where one's self ends and where the environment begins can contact take place. The relationship can be described as one of dialectical opposites: the organism has a need; something in the environment can meet the need. The organism identifies that portion of the environment that can meet its need, then seeks so to manipulate the object that the needs of

¹⁴³Frederick S. Perls, The Gestalt Approach (Berkeley, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973), p. 15.

¹⁴⁴Frederick S. Perls, Ralph E. Hefferline and Paul Goodman, Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality (New York: Dell, 1951), p. 229.

¹⁴⁵Perls, Gestalt Approach, p. 16.

¹⁴⁶Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 229.

the organism are met.¹⁴⁷ A thirsty woman desires a drink of water. A lonely man desires companionship. A child desires to be let into her house. Each person seeks out the object from among all others in the environment that will meet her or his need. When the object--whether a glass of water, a friend, or a housekey--has been found, the person so interacts with that object that his or her needs are met. When the need is met, the person loses interest in the object for the present and seeks out the object that will gratify whatever need is subsequently experienced.

2. Contact and Withdrawal

The effective meeting of one's need involves active contacting of that object in the environment which is perceived as being able to meet one's dominant need. Perls likens the process of contact to the chewing of food--the indispensable means of preparing the contacted object for digestion and assimilation:

There can be no assimilation without prior destruction (destructuring); otherwise the experience is swallowed whole (introjected), never becomes our own--and does not nourish us.¹⁴⁸

Broadly speaking, Perls understands contact to include "every kind of living relation that occurs at the boundary

¹⁴⁷Perls, Gestalt Approach, pp. 17-18.

¹⁴⁸Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 68.

in the interaction of the individual and environment,"¹⁴⁹ including "appetite and rejection, approaching and avoiding, sensing, feeling, manipulating, estimating, communicating, fighting, etc."¹⁵⁰

When the contacted object has been dealt with in a satisfying way, the gestalt ("a structure or configuration of . . . phenomena so integrated as to constitute a functional unit with properties not derivable from its parts in summation"¹⁵¹) is closed and the individual withdraws from the cathected object.

Contact and withdrawal are viewed as the most important functions of the total personality. They are polar aspects of the ability to discriminate. Contact forms a gestalt, withdrawing closes the gestalt. There is a sense of life's basic rhythm about the relationship between contact and withdrawal: persons are in some sense in contact with the environment when they are awake; they withdraw from the environment when they sleep.¹⁵²

Good contact--"a clear, bright figure freely energized from an empty background"¹⁵³--facilitates the

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 229.

¹⁵⁰Ibid.

¹⁵¹Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged (Springifeld, MA: Merriam, 1968), p. 952.

¹⁵²Perls, Gestalt Approach, pp. 21-22.

¹⁵³Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 255.

organism's meeting its dominant need, i.e., closing its dominant incompletely gestalt.

This process of contacting--touching the loved, interesting, or appetizing object, or expelling from the field, by avoidance or annihilation, the dangerous or painful object, is in general a continuous sequence. . . ; the whole process is an aware mounting excitement.¹⁵⁴

Withdrawal can be the means either of closing a gestalt or of "rallying one's forces to make closure possible."¹⁵⁵

3. Autonomy

Perls describes the healthy personality--i.e., the personality formed through the making of good contact--as "autonomous, responsible, and self-known through and through as playing a definite role in the actual situation."¹⁵⁶

Perls is at pains to differentiate autonomy from spontaneity:

In spontaneous behavior, everything is novel and progressively made one's own; in autonomy the behavior is one's own because in principle it has already been achieved and assimilated.¹⁵⁷

Autonomy, then, is gained as the result of the process of contact and assimilation and is a characteristic of the personality. (Perls defines personality as "the system of attitudes assumed in interpersonal relations; . . . the

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

¹⁵⁵Perls, Gestalt Approach, p. 23.

¹⁵⁶Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 382.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 383.

assumption of what one is. . . .¹⁵⁸⁾

4. Response-ability

The neurotic individual, whose personality includes mistaken self-concepts, is often unable to sense his or her dominant needs or to contact objects in the environment so as effectively to meet those needs. He or she is unclear about the boundaries that exist between self and environment because all the unfinished business of his life, all the interruptions to the ongoing process, have disturbed his sense of orientation, and he is no longer able to distinguish between those objects or persona in the environment which have a positive cathexis; he no longer knows when or from what to withdraw.¹⁵⁹

The neurotic has limited response-ability, the capability of responding to the situation:

Responsibility can also be spelled response-ability: the ability to respond, to have thoughts, reactions, emotions, in a certain situation. Now, this responsibility, the ability to be what one is, is expressed through the word "I."¹⁶⁰

The ability to respond to other persons, to experience contact with them, is a human need.

On the psychological level, man needs contact with other human beings as much as, on the physiological level, he needs food and drink.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 382.

¹⁵⁹Perls, Gestalt Approach, pp. 23-24.

¹⁶⁰Frederick S. Perls, Gestalt Therapy Verbatim (Lafayette, CA: Real Peoples Press, 1969), p. 65.

¹⁶¹Perls, Gestalt Approach, p. 25. See also Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 278.

At the heart of all neuroses is the inability to distinguish properly between oneself and the environment. Perls has delineated four neurotic mechanisms. Introjection is the tendency to make oneself responsible for what actually is part of the environment. The introjecting person says "I" when she or he means "they."¹⁶² Projection is the tendency to make the environment responsible for what originates in the self. Projecting persons say "it" or "they" when they mean "I."¹⁶³ Retroflection occurs when the person turns against him- or herself, literally becoming his or her own worst enemy. Such a person's speech is full of the word "myself."¹⁶⁴ Confluence occurs when the individual experiences no boundary between self and environment. Confluent persons often use the word "we."¹⁶⁵

5. Confluence

The mechanism of confluence is crucial to this presentation. Confluence, "the condition of no-contact (no self-boundary),"¹⁶⁶ can be healthy as well as neurotic.

It is only where confluence is maintained as a means of preventing contact that it is unhealthy. After contact has been achieved and lived through, confluence has

¹⁶²Perls, Gestalt Approach, pp. 32-35.

¹⁶³Ibid., pp. 35-38. ¹⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 40-41.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 38-40.

¹⁶⁶Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 451.

an entirely different meaning.¹⁶⁷

We are in confluence with everything we are fundamentally, unproblematically or irremediably dependent on: where there is no need or possibility of a change. A child is in confluence with his family, an adult with his community, a man with the universe.¹⁶⁸

The distinction between healthy and neurotic confluences is that neurotic confluence "cannot be contacted because of the repression."¹⁶⁹ Neurotically confluent persons aim "to get the other to make all the effort."¹⁷⁰ This is well illustrated in Perls' words to a client:

This I find very often in fat women, that they have no ego boundaries. They don't have a self. They always live through other people and other people become themselves. You can't distinguish what is me and what is you. "If you cry, then I cry. If you enjoy yourself, then I enjoy myself. . . ."

You have no contact boundaries. What you touch, what you taste, what you see, whatever the contact boundary is, is fuzzy, or maybe nonexistent, so you are boundless, so you have to get fatter and fatter until you occupy the whole universe. . . .

You can't react to her. You destroy her . . . by taking her in. . . .

There is no contact. Contact is the appreciation of differences. . . .¹⁷¹

It can be inferred from the above depiction of a neurotically confluent person that, not only can such a person not contact others, she or he cannot withdraw from them either. Demanding likeness and refusing to tolerate

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 451.

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 452.

¹⁷¹Perls, Gestalt Therapy Verbatim, pp. 246-48.

differences, "the archetypal instances are unaware sucking or clinging to warmth and body-contact that are not felt but whose absence makes one freeze."¹⁷²

6. In Continuing Relationships

Perls cites spousal relationships as fertile fields for the occurrence of unhealthy confluence:

The parties . . . cannot conceive of any but the most momentous difference of opinion or attitude. If a discrepancy in their views becomes manifest, they cannot work it out to a point of reaching genuine agreement or else agreeing to disagree. No, they must either restore the disturbed confluence by whatever means they can or else flee into isolation. . . .

To restore interrupted confluence one attempts to adjust oneself to the other or the other to oneself. In the first case one becomes a yes-man, tries to make up, frets about small differences, needs proof of total acceptance; one effaces his own individuality, propitiates, and becomes slavish. In the other case where one cannot stand contradiction, one persuades, bribes, compels or bullies.¹⁷³

Perls acknowledges that healthy confluence may exist in marriage, when one spouse knows the other well enough to assume that person is "like oneself."¹⁷⁴ Such an assumption must, however, be confirmed from time to time through contactful interaction. Healthy relationships are always potentially contactful--i.e., they feature "appreciation of what the other actually is, not what one

¹⁷²Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 451.

¹⁷³Ibid., p. 121.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 122.

construes him to be."¹⁷⁵

Perls views sexual intercourse as an intense experience of contact in which partners seek the closest possible contact with one another until

in the moment of the orgasm there is a confluence, a oneness between the man and the woman so that world and individuality cease to exist. But this confluence is the climax of the rising curve of personal, skin, and finally, genital contact. The dissolving of the contact/isolation phenomenon into confluence is experienced as intense satisfaction.¹⁷⁶

Healthy relationships include times of withdrawal or isolation:

Contact includes its dialectical opposite: isolation. . . . Without the isolation component contact becomes confluence.¹⁷⁷

Growth cannot take place in a relationship between chronically confluent persons because only contact permits an individual to deal with the novel, and then to change as the result of having assimilated (dealt with) some new reality. If, therefore, a relationship is characterized by each person's appreciating the boundary between self and the other involved in the relationship, contact and withdrawal can take place, change and growth can occur in each individual, and differences can be viewed as opportunities for enhancing the richness and texture of the relationship.

¹⁷⁵Perls, Gestalt Approach, p. 56.

¹⁷⁶Frederick S. Perls, Ego, Hunger and Aggression (New York: Random House, 1947), p. 167.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 65.

7. Process and Awareness

Two concepts from Perls remain to be presented: process and awareness. The two are not unrelated. In talking about process, Perls has used the metaphor of a phonograph needle touching a record. The sound appears when the two make contact. However,

if I stop the phonograph record, then the needle is still in contact with the record, but there is no music, because there is the absolute now.¹⁷⁸

The point to be made is that three elements are involved in experience: the past, anticipation of the future, and the now through which we are continually receiving the continuum of experience.

Awareness, a here-and-now phenomenon, is the necessary prerequisite for contact and withdrawal and for full participation in the continuing process of experience.

If . . . we consider the three dimensions possible--extension, duration, and awareness--then we can say everything is an aware process.¹⁷⁹

In order for full contact to take place one must be aware of one's boundary and of the novelty, the difference, between self and the other being contacted.

8. In Conclusion

This exposition of portions of Perls' thought will

¹⁷⁸Perls, Gestalt Therapy Verbatim, p. 41.

¹⁷⁹Frederick S. Perls, Eyewitness to Therapy (Ben Lomand, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973), p. 192.

be closed with two radically different quotations, each from Perls' writings, each relating to the interrelationship of intimacy and autonomy.

For consider that if the association of two persons will in fact be deeply profitable to them, then the destruction of the incompatible existing forms they have come with is a motion toward their more intrinsic selves--that will be actualized in the coming new figure; in this release of the more intrinsic, bound energy is liberated and this will transfer to the liberating agent as love. The process of mutual destruction is probably the chief proving ground of profound compatibility. Our unwillingness to risk it is obviously a fear that if we lose this we shall have nothing; we prefer poor food to none; we have become habituated to scarcity and starvation [italics not in original].¹⁸⁰

I am my lab.

The privacy of your experiences is unknown to me
Except for revelations.

There is no bridge from man to man.

I guess, imagine, empathize, whatever this may mean.

For strangers we are, and strangers we stay

Except for some identities where you and I
In sameness blend together.

Or better still, where you touch me

And I touch you,

When strangeness feels familiar.¹⁸¹

F. NORMATIVE DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The theological and psychological material that has been presented will now be utilized to confirm, expand, and adapt the provisional definitions of autonomy and intimacy that were presented in Chapter I. The resulting definitions will be normative for this study.

¹⁸⁰Perls, Gestalt Therapy, p. 342.

¹⁸¹Frederick S. Perls, In and Out of the Garbage Pail (Lafayette, CA: Real People Press, 1969), unnumbered page.

1. Autonomy

The provisional definition of autonomy¹⁸² made reference to "the combined qualities of independence, self-support, and self-direction and to the placing of a high value upon the independence, self-support, and self-direction of others." All four theorists' writings support this portion of the definition. Tillich's emphases upon self-identity, being fully centered, accepting the peculiarities of the other, and the polar attributes of individualization and of freedom all lend support. Richardson's stress upon the unity of the individual and upon encouraging individuality and intimacy lends support. Erikson's foci upon autonomy and identity and his statement that "only two uniquely different beings" can experience intimacy lend support. Perls' emphasis upon the ability to withdraw and to experience isolation lends support; his stress upon the need for experiencing what he terms "mutual destruction" would imply support.

The provisional definition of autonomy contains the phrase, "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy." This statement is explicitly supported by Tillich's emphasis upon affirming oneself, by Richardson's use of the term "self-fidelity," and by Erikson's definitions of basic trust and identity. Nothing that Perls wrote would suggest that

¹⁸²See above, pp. 6-8, for provisional definitions.

he would disagree with this phrase's being included in a definition of autonomy.

Another phrase of the provisional definition of autonomy is, "the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint." This statement is supported by Tillich's writings concerning the moral imperative and the subject-object phenomenon that each person's autonomy is limited by the other's absolute claim to be dealt with as a person who is neither to be treated as an object nor to be "helped" as though that person were dependent upon others in order to grow and seek self enhancement. Erikson's terms initiative and, especially, will give strong support.

The provisional definition's phrase, "the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to society," is supported by Tillich's description of the person who "can participate in the universe and draw elements of it into himself," by Erikson's emphases upon what he calls industry, purpose, and competence, by Perls' focus upon the organism and environment as together forming a total system while at the same time the organism is different from its environment, and implicitly by Richardson's Sabbath-centered theology that underscores the importance of life as it is.

The phrase in the provisional definition, "a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness," is supported by Tillich's term individualization, by Richardson's stress upon

the presence with us of "the Unity of the unities," by Erikson's concepts of identity and hope, and by Perls' emphasis upon the importance of being "self-known."

The theorists' support of the statement which concludes the provisional definition, "autonomy does not imply nonconformity as an end in itself, nor does it connote the avoidance of responsibilities and obligations," can be seen in Perls' use of the term "responsible," in Tillich's call for a quality of acceptance in which one is to be accepting of the other's peculiarities, in Richardson's emphasis upon knowing the other, and in Erikson's writing about what one person "owes" to another.

The provisional definition of autonomy, then, is confirmed in its entirety by the theorists. It remains to ask whether the definition may be amplified by the writings of Tillich, Richardson, Erikson and Perls.

The writings of Tillich and Perls stress the importance of the autonomous person's being self-aware. Tillich refers to self-awareness as being "the decisive step in the self-integration of life." Perls describes the autonomous person as being "self-known through and through" and emphasizes the importance of being aware of one's boundaries. Erikson's writings imply that awareness of one's identity is a prerequisite for intimacy. Richardson refers to the importance of individuals' being able to experience themselves as unique.

This material provides ample justification for expanding the definition of autonomy to include the term "self-awareness."

The sources support the inclusion of the concept of "growth" in this study's definition of autonomy. Growth is a part of Tillich's "life process," particularly of the function of self-creation. It is implicit in Perls' rhythmic movement between contact, assimilation, and withdrawal. Both Erikson and Richardson, each in his unique way, emphasize a growing, process-oriented flow through the autonomous person's life.

Explicit in the writings of Tillich and implicit in the writings of the other sources is the consideration that the autonomous individual will experience anxiety but not despair. The description of autonomy as "not despairing" will be added to this study's normative definition.

2. Intimacy

The provisional definition of intimacy made reference to the relational aspect of intimacy. More will be said about relationality in the amplification portion of this section. Presently it is sufficient to affirm that all four sources understand intimacy to be a relational phenomenon. This conclusion is implicit in much of the discussion that follows.

The provisional definition of intimacy contains the

phrase, "each person's experiencing 'the inmost character' of the other, knowing 'that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship.'" Erikson's description of persons as "daring to risk ego loss" in intimacy supports this statement. Perls' challenge to persons that they be willing to undergo what he calls "the process of mutual destruction" in order to experience love and the rich nourishment of intimacy supports this statement. Tillich's emphasis upon awareness of the other lends support. Richardson clearly supports this portion of the definition in his description of personal communion as requiring persons to have the capacity "to open themselves to each other and to reveal the uniqueness of themselves as persons."

The provisional definition of intimacy includes the sentence, "It includes warm mutual regard, deep friendship, and mutual cherishing." Erikson's description of love and Richardson's understanding of "self-consciousness" as enabling persons to "be friends" give clear support to this portion of the definition. Tillich's phrase "the communion of personal encounter" lends support and Perls' mention of

. . . some identities where you and I
In sameness blend together.
Or better still, where you touch me
And I touch you,
When strangeness feels familiar.

indicates a yearning for--a valuing of--such a quality of

intimacy.

The provisional definition states, "An intimate relationship ordinarily has a history; it does not simply leap into existence." This statement is supported by Tillich's understanding of "destiny" and by Erikson's reference to the "life-long process" of intimacy. It is implicitly supported by Richardson's sense of growth and process. Perls does not appear to be interested in the issue of history; such an issue is largely irrelevant to his emphasis upon the here-and-now. The phrase under consideration will be retained in this study's definition of intimacy.

The provisional definition of intimacy's final sentence is, "Persons who experience intimacy in their relationship tend to consider themselves accountable to one another and seek to understand one another more and more fully." Tillich's concepts of "justice" and "humanity" support this portion of the definition, as do his terms "life-process" and "self-creation," cited above. Perls' writings concerning the contact-boundary and process lend corroboration. Richardson and Erikson also support the sentence: Erikson through his definition of "fidelity" and his understanding of process and Richardson through his concept of process and his definition of relationality.

The provisional definition of intimacy, then, is confirmed. It remains to ask how the definition may be amplified by the insights of Tillich, Richardson, Erikson,

and Perls.

The writings of the sources demand that some statement be included in this study's definition of intimacy that takes into account the polar relationship that intimacy has with autonomy. If participation is taken to be synonymous with intimacy and individualization is taken to be synonymous with autonomy, we must then paraphrase Tillich that intimacy and autonomy are so interrelated that each can have meaning only so long as the other coexists with it. Erikson's system maintains that, since each life stage's crisis resolution becomes a part of the individual and remains a part of the individual's dynamic functioning, a sense of personal autonomy is a necessary prerequisite for a person's developing a capacity for intimacy. Perls' emphases upon the appreciation of differences, the contact-boundary, and contact-withdrawal, lend strong support, as does Richardson's writing concerning relationality as not subsuming the individuals whom it relates.

The normative definition of intimacy, then will contain a statement that intimacy can occur only between autonomous persons.

The sources strongly support a statement that intimacy takes place between persons who regard one another as equals. Only such persons will be willing to risk Erikson's "ego-destruction" and Tillich's "resistance of the other." Only such persons will be able to experience

Richardson's "friendship" and allow themselves to undergo Perls' "process of mutual deconstructuring."

The definition of intimacy, then, will be expanded to include a reference to a basic sense of equality between persons who participate in an intimate relationship.

Some statement must also be included in the amplified definition that makes reference to transcendency.

Tillich has strongly emphasized that only a sense of the transcendent--which comes through, though is not identical with, religion--can enable persons so to conquer loneliness, self-seclusion, and hostility that they can be "lifted above" themselves and enabled to experience "communion in interdependence." Richardson likewise stresses the Transcendent as being "the Unity of the unities" through whom the unity of the relationality is experienced.

The normative definition of intimacy, then, will include a reference to the experiencing of the transcendent.

3. The Normative Definition of Autonomy

In this study autonomy refers to the combined qualities of self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction and to the placing of a high value upon the self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction of others. It is characterized by the awareness of oneself as trustworthy, the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint, the experiencing of

growth, the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to society, the absence of despair, and a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness.

As it is used in this study, autonomy does not imply nonconformity as an end in itself, nor does it connote the avoidance of responsibilities and obligations.

4. The Normative Definition of Intimacy

In this study intimacy refers to an occurrence in a growing relationship between two autonomous persons who regard one another as equals. Intimacy is characterized by each person's experiencing "the inmost character of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship." It includes warm mutual regard, deep friendship, and mutual cherishing. Persons who experience intimacy also experience a transcendent quality in the relationship.

An intimate relationship ordinarily has a history; it does not simply leap into existence. Persons who experience intimacy in their relationship tend to consider themselves accountable to one another and seek to understand one another more and more fully.

G. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented theological and psychological perspectives from the writings of Paul Tillich,

Herbert W. Richardson, Erik H. Erikson, and Frederick S. Perls. These perspectives have been employed in the creation of normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy. These normative definitions will be utilized validationally in Chapter V and dialogically in Chapter VI to generate conclusions, hypotheses, and questions for further research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOLLOWED
IN THE GATHERING OF DATA

A. INTRODUCTION

The data gathered for this study are case materials intended to enable the exemplifying of marriages of persons who have high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy, and the contrasting of such marriages with other types of marriages. This chapter divides itself into sections setting forth the means of 1) obtaining a group of couples from whom subject couples could be selected, 2) analyzing of data and subsequent development of provisional classificatory categories, 3) selection of six couples to be interviewed, 4) means of interviewing the subject couples.

B. OBTAINING A GROUP OF COUPLES FROM
WHOM SUBJECT COUPLES COULD BE SELECTED

The researcher made use of his position as Director-Counselor of the Inter-Church Counseling Service of Whittier, California, and sent letters to the nineteen ministers of the nine congregations that support the Counseling Service, requesting their assistance in the research he was undertaking as a part of his Ph.D. dissertation. Each

letter asked its recipient to send

names, addresses and phone numbers of between five and ten married couples who belong to the church you serve and who you think might be willing to take a pencil-and-paper test, then be interviewed by me.

The letter asked that the couples be as varied as possible as to ages, amount of formal education, profession, etc., and indicated that the researcher would introduce himself to the couples by telling them that their names had been given to him by their minister. A stamped, self-addressed envelope and a form providing for the listing of the names, addresses, and phone numbers of ten couples were enclosed.¹

Ten of the nineteen ministers contacted responded with a total of ninety couples within a three-week period.² Letters were sent to each of these ninety couples, indicating the name of the pastor who had submitted their names, and stating that the referring pastor had thought they might be interested in helping me with research I'm doing in connection with my Ph.D. dissertation in pastoral counseling.

The research was described as "in the area of how married couples relate to each other." The letter requested that addressees "take pencil-and-paper tests and then, if I request it, let me interview each of you."

The letter estimated that taking the test would

¹The letter is displayed in Appendix A.

²Two additional ministers submitted lists at a later date; names on these lists were not used in the research.

require an hour of the couple's time, and offered two times at which the test could be taken. It also indicated that in the event that the two of you are selected for interviewing, arrangements would be made for a time and a place that would be mutually convenient. The interview with each of you would last about an hour and a half.

As gains from taking part in the research, the letter promised each person a self-explanatory profile sheet and said, "From this, and especially from the interviews of those persons who are selected, more learning about self and marriage should result." The letter promised the observing of strict confidence.

A stamped, self-addressed postal card was enclosed on which respondents could indicate a) that they would take part and at which time they would take the test, b) that they did not wish to take part, or c) that they would like to take part but that the dates offered were inconvenient. Respondents were asked to return the card whether or not they wished to take part and those who chose to take part were promised a telephone call which would confirm their participation and give them the location at which the test would be administered.³

Sixty-six of the ninety couples returned cards: twenty-four indicated that they did not wish to take part; twenty-one indicated that they desired to take part but

³The letter and the card enclosed are displayed as Appendix B and C respectively.

that the offered dates were inconvenient; twenty-one indicated that they would take the tests on one of the offered dates.

Eighteen of the twenty-one couples who had indicated they would take the test actually did so. The researcher then scheduled an additional testing date and called the twenty-one couples who had indicated an interest in taking part in the research if a more convenient date could be established. On the additional testing date thirteen couples took the test.

A pool of thirty-one couples, both members of whom had taken the Personal Orientation Inventory, was thus established.

C. ANALYZING OF DATA AND SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT OF PROVISIONAL CLASSIFICATORY CATEGORIES

In Chapter One three categories of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) that appear to be relevant to this study were listed: the Other-Inner Directed Ratio, the Inner-Directed Percentile, and the Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile. The optimum Other-Inner Directed Ratio for self-actualizing persons has been established as 1:3--three times as much support received from interior

sources as is received from external sources.⁴ Scores deviating below this figure are understood to be in the "normal range" between approximately 1:2.5 and 1:1.8, and in the "non-self-actualizing range" below 1:1.8.⁵ A range of 1:2 to 1:5 was considered to be generally within the self-actualizing range for the purposes of this study.

Percentile scores are considered to be self-actualizing if they fall between the norm mean of 50 and the sixtieth percentile.⁶ For the purposes of this study a range of 46 to 64 was considered to be generally within the self-actualizing range.

Two types of "lie profiles" have been established as characteristic of the POI: persons attempting to convey a favorable impression without having knowledge of self-actualizing concepts will tend to display extremely elevated Self-Regard scores together with depressed Self-Acceptance and Existentiality scores;⁷ persons having knowledge of self-actualizing concepts will display a

⁴Everett L. Shostrom, Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory (San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1974), p. 15.

⁵Ibid., p. 16.

⁶Ibid., pp. 17-18.

⁷The POI's categories are Time Ratio, for which Time Incompetence and Time Competence scores are used; Support Ratio, for which Other-Directed Support and Inner-Directed Support scores are used; and the following percentile scores: Self-Actualizing Values, Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, Self Regard, Self Acceptance, Nature of Man, Synergy, Acceptance of Aggression, and Capacity for Intimate Contact.

"uniformly hyperelevated profile"--scoring well above the sixtieth percentile on most items.⁸

Eleven of the couples in the pool were eliminated because one or both members of each couple displayed a lie profile, thus leaving a pool of twenty couples from which to select subjects. Eight of these couples featured both members' recording acceptably high scores in the three categories chosen as appearing to relate to this study. Ten couples featured one member's scoring acceptably high in the chosen categories and one member's scoring below these categories. Two couples featured both member's scoring beneath the acceptable levels in all categories.

Two categories were then developed as provisionally classificatory: "High-High" couples (in which both members scored as self-actualizing in their Other-Inner Directed Ratios, their Inner-Directed Percentiles, and their Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentiles); and "High-Low" couples (in which one member scored as self-actualizing in the three categories and one member scored below the self-actualizing parameters in the three categories).

D. SELECTION OF SIX COUPLES TO BE INTERVIEWED

From the group of eight couples both members of

⁸Robert R. Knapp, Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory (San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1976), p. 74.

whom had scored acceptably high in the three categories chosen for emphasis in this study three "High-High" subject couples were selected. Selection was made on the basis of how optimally each spouse's scores in the three chosen categories fit the established POI norms of self-actualization.

From the group of ten couples one member of whom had scored acceptably within the parameters of the chosen categories and one member of whom had scored below the parameters, three "High-Low" subject couples were selected. Selection was made on the basis of how nearly the higher-scoring partner's scores fell within the POI's self-actualizing parameters and how great a divergence existed between the scores of the higher-scoring partner and the scores of the lower-scoring partner.

E. MEANS OF INTERVIEWING THE SUBJECT COUPLES

The chosen couples were contacted by telephone and told that they had been selected for interviewing. An hour-and-a-half appointment with the interviewer was arranged for each member of the subject couples. Both members of four of the six couples met with the interviewer at his office. Both members of two of the couples--Couple Two and Couple Six--requested the interviewer to meet with them in their homes. The interviews included all the questions listed in Chapter One and varied in length between forty

minutes (for the husband of Couple Six) to a full ninety minutes (for the husband of Couple Five). The interviews were tape-recorded.

F. SUMMARY

This chapter has detailed the means employed in obtaining case material much of which it was hoped could be utilized in exemplifying marriages of persons who have high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy, and contrasting such marriages with other types of marriages. The case material obtained by this methodology will be presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE COUPLES

A. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

In this chapter the study's raw data will be presented: the six couples who were given depth interviews will be introduced in some detail as a means of imparting a measure of the fabric and richness of the relationships being studied.

The material for each couple will be presented in a way that will best facilitate comparison between couples. Biographical and informational data will introduce each couple; the remainder of the information concerning each couple will follow the order of the questions of the depth interview.¹

B. THE SIX COUPLES

The couples both members of whom scored in or near the optimal ranges for both autonomy and intimacy will be called Couples One, Two and Three; the couples one member of whom scored in or near the optimal range and one member of whom scored below that range will be called Couples Four, Five and Six. In Couple Four the husband is the lower

¹The questions used in the depth interview are included in Chapter I, pp. 20-22.

scoring partner; in Couples Five and Six the wife is the lower scoring partner.

Several general remarks may introduce the couples. All twelve persons have lived in Southern California for at least thirteen years; five persons are native to the area. The average number of years that the twelve persons have spent in Southern California is twenty-nine; the average age of the twelve subjects is 45.5. The average length of the subjects' marriages is twenty-four years. The average number of years of formal education is 15.6. The average number of siblings each of the twelve persons has is 2.5. Five of the six couples are composed of persons who are within one year of being the same age. Five of the six couples have two children; the sixth couple has one child. All six of the women as well as all six of the men are trained for gainful employment outside of the home. All twelve persons are Caucasians.

Each of the couples will be presented in detail.

1. Couple One

The first of the subject couples to be described will be called Roy and Janet Holmes.² Roy's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.8, an Inner-Directed Percentile of

²Subjects' actual names will not be used.

54, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 46. He is thirty-one, the second of seven children. He was born in Ohio and has lived in Southern California for twenty-four years. He has been married three years; this is his first marriage. He has two stepchildren: a girl, eight, and a boy, five. His occupation is that of urban planner. He has a Bachelor's degree and is one semester away from receiving a Master's degree. He describes his religious beliefs as "eclectic"³ and declines to label his political views as being either conservative, moderate, or liberal. He is "not sure" whether he would describe himself as sensitive; he does feel that he is sensitive towards his wife, however. He shares "a little" in doing housework. He has "no strong feelings" about Woman's Liberation. He is "unenthusiastic" about the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in that he does not feel that its passage would make much actual difference in the practice of discrimination. He would vote for it, given the opportunity to do so. He has received psychotherapy and believes it to be responsible in large measure for his present happiness.

Janet's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.4, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 52, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of '60. She is

³All quotations in this section, unless otherwise indicated, are from transcripts of tape-recorded interviews with the subjects.

thirty and an only child. She was born and has lived all her life in Whittier. She has been married three years; this is her second marriage, the first having ended in divorce. She has two children by her first husband: a girl, eight, and a boy, five. She works approximately twelve hours a week as a recreation therapist. She has a B.A. degree plus ten additional units. She describes her religious beliefs as "liberal" and her political views as "moderate." She is an advocate of Woman's Liberation "with qualifications," and is definitely supportive of the ERA. She has received psychotherapy and describes it as having been helpful in facilitating her adjustment to her divorce.

Responding to the question, "What's it like to live with Janet?" Roy said,

I quite honestly am tickled pink. . . . I get all the emotional support that I could ever want. She supports me. When I come home angry about work she talks with me about it and we talk it over and it seems like about twice a week we talk over plans for the future.

Janet responded to a similar question, "It makes me very happy. . . . I'm very happy and very satisfied with my life."

When asked why he supposed Janet and he had differences of opinion, Roy replied, "We're different people." Responding to the same question, Janet said, "We're two separate people." When asked to describe how they handled the differences, Roy said,

Once it's clear we have a difference we both pull back

and take a look at it and maybe it'll come up again some other time and we'll both be more willing to talk about the possibility that there was more than one position involved. It seems to work out.

Janet said,

You accept them. You say, "That is your point of view. I can accept that." If it's something that we really disagree on, then we usually discuss it and leave it at that . . . or maybe take it up later if it's something that is really an emotional issue.

Both Roy and Janet said that it was "okay" to feel anger toward the other and each denied that there was "any way it [was] not okay to feel" toward the other.

Roy reported that Janet and he spend about two hours of time with each other during a typical day, adding, "There are lots of times when I'm at school or she's got a meeting or something like that and we don't get anything, but we both enjoy a couple of hours together." Janet said that Roy and she spend about twenty hours a week together.

Both reported a need to have time alone. Janet was particularly emphatic about this:

We both go through periods where we like to be alone. I'm an only child, and Roy was raised with . . . five brothers and a sister, so we enjoy being alone. . . . I enjoy being by myself with a book. So does he. We're both readers. We can be together in the house, but off by ourselves reading books or doing crossword puzzles. We don't get together, in other words, unless we're both in the mood to communicate. We have a great deal of respect for each other's feelings as far as being alone [is concerned], because we both work in such tremendous, people-oriented, pressure jobs that you have to have that time by yourself.

Roy said, "There are times when we both like to be by ourselves. . . . I don't do a lot of it." Ways he listed in

which he is by himself include time jogging and backpacking.

Both were explicit that they spend time with the children. Janet reported spending about thirty hours a week with the children "disciplining them or helping them with homework or getting them ready to go" and about three hours a week of "positive, enjoyable time." John reported some negative feelings toward the children's natural father:

I get jealous if he gets a hell of a lot of attention that I'd love to have. I feel like I get a lot of the dirty work of raising them. They're really nice kids and they also give a lot back to me.

Janet stated that Roy and she try to rear the children to respect the property and privacy of every other family member. She also reported spending time specifically telling the children that they need not accept as their own the opinions of anyone else--including parents and teachers--and encouraging them to think for themselves. "I think our whole attitude is, 'Whatever is best for the development of the individual,' in our house. Also that development has to fit into our family unit," she said.

"We both handle our own separate finances," responded Janet when the subject of money was raised. She described her account as consisting of child support payments and earnings from her job, and Roy's account as consisting of his salary. Her account cares for food, clothing, the children's schooling (they attend a private school), and "any extras." Roy clarified, "We try to save

what she earns," and added, "She takes care of the taxes entirely." (Apparently only the child support payments Janet receives are used to care for food, clothing, schooling, and taxes, thus leaving the earnings from her job to be designated for a savings account.) Both accounts are joint accounts, although normally neither would write checks on the other's account. Both decide on major purchases.

Janet remarked,

We both have a lot of respect for each other's money and we, I think, feel better about each having our own money. He doesn't feel guilty if he takes \$50 out of his checking account and goes on a fishing trip with it, and I don't feel guilty if I take \$50 out of my checking account and go buy shoes, or a dress, or something with that money. Again, it's another way of providing autonomy. [The interviewer had not introduced the term "autonomy" into the conversation.]

When asked whether the marriage had changed over its three years, Roy responded,

I think it's better now than when we first got married. She had a lot of feelings that she had to work out and I was still working out some things about myself and I think we've both grown so that we're more secure. She's actually blossomed. I'm really kind of tickled because she's so much more [of a] stable, sure, secure, assertive person than she was when we got married, and for that matter, I feel I am too. It's like having a good foundation for the family. . . . I think our marriage is much stronger. I think the children are happier.

He was particularly pleased that Janet had returned to school and adequately trained herself to do the sort of work she enjoys doing. He acknowledged that the acquisition of an "instant family" had required a major adjustment. Describing the adjustment, he said, "There was

a long time where it was 'yours' and 'mine' and now it's become 'ours,' so it seems to be working out really well." Janet reported that both feel "more secure" after three years of marriage. She said that she does not see specific changes in either Roy or herself.

Responding to a question regarding frequency of sexual intercourse, Roy reported two to four times a week as average whereas Janet replied,

It varies. Sometimes we'll go for a week or ten days without having intercourse and then we'll have intercourse twice a day for a week. It's a matter of communication. Whenever we feel like we want to communicate, either verbally or sexually or in any other way, then we do. . . . It's very spontaneous.

She described their house as being so arranged that Roy and she can create privacy for themselves whenever they wish. Both described Janet as orgasmic. Janet said that she had not been orgasmic in her first marriage and amplified,

Being a good lover . . . is not being a self-oriented person, it's waiting for me to achieve satisfaction in my sexual relationship. . . . I had decided that I would not [again] marry someone who was not a good lover because I think that reflects in so many other ways your attitudes toward the person.

When asked to compare their marriage to their parents' marriages, Roy described his parents' marriage as basically unlike his own, whereas Janet stated that her parents' marriage serves as a model for hers. Roy said, "I would contrast my marriage now [as being] about everything that my parents' is not." He described as differences that his father is volatile and ineffective, that his mother is

in "complete financial control," and that neither parent is demonstrative.

When asked what he credits for Janet's and his satisfactory marital adjustment, Roy replied, "We were very close to finding ourselves and, in getting married, [it] was kind of like the frosting on the cake." Janet, as was mentioned above, used the term "autonomy" without having had it mentioned by the interviewer. At the conclusion of the interview, after the interviewer had told her that he was studying autonomy and intimacy, she responded, "Those were the two things that I did not have in my first marriage that I wanted more than anything else." She credited her happiness in her marriage at least in part to having consciously sought a relationship in which she could experience both autonomy and intimacy.

Neither reported wanting to change anything about the marriage other than the location of the house in relation to where they worked (Janet) and "to reduce some of the stress that I feel through my work" (Roy).

Asked to describe first a good wife and then a good husband, Roy personalized both descriptions:

If it was a good wife for me I wouldn't describe anything different than what I have.

I try to be a good husband.

Characteristics he listed for a good wife were that she be supportive and "utterly dependable." A good husband, he

said, would be supportive, would "try and be aware," and would be responsive to the feelings of his wife and children--thus bringing the subject of children into his description. He also spoke of the importance of a good husband's "not conflict[ing] with the wife's strong points." Janet did not explicitly personalize her description of either a good wife or a good husband. Among terms she used to describe a good husband she included, "a good companion," "a good friend," sexual fidelity, trustworthiness, consideration, openness, "a good lover." She said she would describe a good wife "the same way," and explicitly added that a good wife should be "interested in sharing in every way," communicative, sexually faithful, honest, supportive, and "should back her husband up no matter what happens if she believes in him."

To the question, "If you had it to do over again, do you think you'd marry Janet?" Roy replied, "In a minute," adding, "I don't find any other options that really satisfy me." To a similar question, Janet responded, "Oh, in a minute, yes."

Asked why she imagined she had been chosen to be interviewed, Janet replied, "I haven't the slightest idea." Roy, however, showed a high degree of insight into the nature of the research project:

From the answers . . . I gave, [I imagined] the results would indicate that I was an honery s.o.b. type of person that just didn't care whether anybody gave a damn.

Of course, [Janet] said she felt the same way too. So I would assume that . . . you were looking for reasonably independent people to see why they would get together.

The Holmes' response to the word-association portion of the interview may be displayed as follows:

| Word | Roy's Association | Roy's Value | Janet's Association | Janet's Value |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Togetherness | Love | + | Companionship | + |
| Loneliness | Pain | - | Unhappiness | - |
| Intimacy | Warm | + | Relating | + |
| Autonomy | Hard | Neutral | Independence | + |
| Separateness | Lonely | - | Autonomy | + |
| Friendship | [No word] | + | Relating | + |
| Sex | [No word] | + | Intimacy | + |
| Husband | Wife | Neutral | Helpmate | + |
| Wife | Husband | Neutral | Helpmate | + |
| Breadwinner | Husband and Wife | Neutral | Supporter | + |
| Homemaker | Woman | Neutral | Caretaker | + |

2. Couple Two

The second of the subject couples will be referred to as Walter and Pearl Kirby. Walter's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.6, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 54, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 53. He is sixty-two, the youngest of four children. He was born in Minnesota and lived there until he moved to Southern California fourteen years ago. He has

been married forty years; this is his first marriage. Pearl and he have one child: a daughter, thirty-eight, who is married, has two children, and lives out of the state. He is employed as a machine tool rebuilder, an occupation to which he devotes six days a week. He has a high school diploma and two years of trade school education. He describes both his religious beliefs and his political views as "moderate." He views himself as "definitely" sensitive. He describes himself as helping with housework "a lot." Of Woman's Liberation, he says, "I can't see it." Of the Equal Rights Amendment, he says, "I'm all for equal rights." He has not received psychotherapy.

Pearl's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.5, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 53, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 56. She is sixty-two, the older of two sisters. Like Walter, she was born and lived all her life in Minnesota until she moved fourteen years ago to Southern California. This forty-year marriage is her first, also. She is a trained commercial artist, having, in addition to her high school education, completed a course in commercial art. She has never, however, practiced as a commercial artist in other than a volunteer capacity--except that she has used her training to good advantage in working with Walter in buying, redecorating and refurbishing, then reselling many houses. She describes both her religious beliefs and her political

views as "moderate." Regarding Woman's Liberation, she says,

I think the woman should get better pay than she does. . . . But . . . the big problems I see in liberation in the young people . . . : our young girls, sixteen, seventeen years old, getting apartments of their own. There's where a lot of our problems are coming in, because they want to be as liberated as the young fellows sexually. . . .

She is in favor of the ERA. She has never received psychotherapy.

When asked what it was like to live with Pearl, Walter said, "We've been extremely happy, very congenial." Pearl's response to a similar question regarding living with Walter, was, "We're best friends, really. . . . We share things, and if he's upset . . . , I seem to give him a different viewpoint."

Walter's response to the question, "Why do you suppose you have differences?" was, "It's just an individual [thing]. . . . We're together so much, but still she's got her opinions of many things, and I've got mine." Pearl's answer was, "We're individuals. I wouldn't want him to parrot what I have to say and I wouldn't definitely want to parrot what he has to say."

Pearl's response to the question, "How do you handle the differences?" follows.

Pearl: Talk.

Interviewer: Talk about them.

Pearl: And talk.

Interviewer: You do a lot of talking.

Pearl: And talk.

Interviewer: Do they usually get worked out that way?

Pearl: Yes, definitely.

Pearl added, "The one word in marriage that I think is the most [important] is 'respect.'" Walter, asked to give an example of the handling of a difference, said,

Well, right now we're talking about getting a van camper. I'd like to get it now. My wife wants to wait another year or two. . . . We'll wait about a year. . . . She's right. We should wait another year.

Both Walter and Pearl indicated that they had no difficulty with feeling and expressing anger toward each other. Pearl said that there was no emotion that "it is not okay" to feel toward Walter. The interviewer did not ask Walter this question.

Walter stated that the schedule of time he spends with Pearl is extremely variable because of her chronic illness. A renal difficulty, the illness is hereditary (their daughter also has it) and was diagnosed when Pearl was twenty-seven. At that time, according to Walter, she was not expected to live until she was thirty. She is often bedridden. The interviewer expressed surprise, commenting upon how well Pearl had appeared to be: cheerful, energetic and outgoing. Walter replied, "Doctors say they look at her and can't believe anything is wrong with her--her looks, her face--but they know that she's extremely ill." When, several days later, many minutes into his interview with Pearl, the interviewer noted that she hadn't

mentioned her illness, Pearl responded, "Well, we don't talk about things," and changed the subject.

When Pearl is feeling well, Walter reported that they spend a few minutes together before he leaves for work in the morning. In the evening, after a sharing of the day's activities and dinner, Walter says that they often go window shopping "just to get out a little while"; otherwise (when she is not feeling well) Pearl goes to bed early and Walter busies himself with his several hobbies. He stated that he seldom watches television. When Pearl feels well, Walter said that they spend at least five hours together each day. Pearl reported that she and Walter spend approximately five hours a day together, including, in the summer, swimming nude in their backyard pool.

Walter said that he generally spends two hours alone each day: an hour in the early morning, usually reading, and an hour in the evening with his hobbies: stamp collecting, model building and photography. Pearl reported that she spends a great deal of her time alone: sewing, watching television, listening to "talk radio"; she added that she often goes out during the day--to lunch, to a garden club, to women's meetings at her church.

Responding to a question concerning how financial matters are cared for, Walter stated that each Friday evening he brings home his paycheck and the two of them allocate the check according to current and expected needs.

Both stated that each writes checks, there apparently being no division of check-writing responsibility. Both stated that Walter balances the checkbook. Pearl stated that money has never been a problem subject in their marriage, that they always discuss expenditures before they are made.

When asked whether his marriage had changed over the years, Walter replied, "Oh, I think it's gotten more solid." He described the adjustment Pearl made when her illness was diagnosed: "She always wanted to go to work, and I said, 'That's it, Pearl; forget about it. . . .' When she got a little older, after we had our daughter, she got the urge to go to work, but the doctor wouldn't hear of it." Walter spoke of his own adjustment to Pearl's physical condition:

She used to be the life of the party. She was always a good time and lots of fun to be with, but in later years we haven't been able to do that. We don't do much socializing at all.

Well, there's a lot of things I would like to do, very much, that she can't do, so I just, I don't mention it, I just don't do it, and it could be going to the theater, going to the Convention Center for some activity, maybe a show or a garden show or something like that, but knowing she can't walk very far, I just don't even mention that it's there, and that I want to go, but I, in the back of my mind, I want to go, and I don't want to go alone. . . . It's sometimes pretty hard, and I feel sometimes, I feel kind of tied that I want to get out alone and just go to one of those shows. . . , but when I have gone alone, which is very rare, I haven't enjoyed it. If she isn't with me I don't enjoy it.

Regarding changes in himself, Walter responded a shorter temper and more difficulty in working with others.

Pearl responded to the question of whether her marriage had changed over the years by saying, "Well, we're not as active as we were when we were younger, but I don't think our marriage has changed." She described Walter as having less "zip" and herself as having become more tolerant.

Both reported having sexual intercourse approximately once a week. Walter added, "And we are lucky to get that." Both spoke of his difficulty in recent years in performing sexually. Pearl believes it is associated with his physical tiredness; Walter is not certain that is the reason: "I went to the doctor about it, and he says, 'It's all in the head, it's all psychological,' and I disagree, very thoroughly." Each had high praise for their sexual relationship: "We both enjoy it to the fullest" (Walter); "We're definitely happy" (Pearl).

Walter described his marriage as being unlike his parents' marriage: "My folks would be like a Model T and ours would be like a Cadillac or Rolls Royce." Points of dissimilarity he listed were that his father was "extremely jealous," was away from home "all of the time," and handled financial matters by himself; his parents argued often about money, were not demonstrative, and appeared to have no intimate life together. Pearl viewed her parents' marriage as highly similar to her own: "My parents had a marvelous, marvelous marriage." Finances were not a difficult

subject; differences were discussed and resolved; both parents were openly affectionate. Regarding the similarity she remarked, "It had to be for them to be living with us." Her parents lived with them for many years, moving from Minnesota to California with them--both are now dead. She noted that her father and Walter were good friends.

Asked what she credited for her happy marriage, Pearl replied, "My parents." She noted that her mother was a Southern Baptist and her father a Lutheran and that they were models to her of how two people can live with their differences while holding one another in high regard and treating each other with respect. Walter credited "her being the kind of wife that I want" and his doing all that he could "to make her happy."

Asked whether she would like to change anything about the marriage, Pearl replied, "No, absolutely not." When the interviewer asked whether she would not like to change the fact that she was ill, Pearl responded,

I don't regret that. That has nothing to, I mean nobody can help it and I just have to live with it the best I can. And the same way with our daughter: I worry about her, I'm concerned about her, but . . . we brought her up to be a very independent person and she knows . . . the time will come when she just can't do any more. I think Walter worries about her more than I do but then he hasn't got the same thing, so. . . .

When asked whether he would like to change anything about his marriage, Walter responded, "Not a thing, only her health."

Asked to describe a good husband, Pearl noted, "What will do for one person won't do for the other," but specified, "Somebody that you could relate to." Asked to describe a good wife, she replied, "There again, it would depend." Walter described a good wife as "a good home-maker" who would rear any children the couple had "with respect . . . for any authority." He stated that she should "be home to make the home a place for her and her children's friends to come in anytime" (he explicitly stated that he felt women should not work outside the home so long as there were minor children living at home). Other attributes he mentioned as characterizing a good wife were "financial wizard[ry]," "good common sense," and the ability to "give." Describing a good husband, he stressed the ability to provide financially for his family and the willingness to talk problems through to a solution.

Asked whether he would marry Pearl "if he had it to do all over again," Walter responded, "I sure would, earlier." He explained that Pearl and he had often told each other that they wished their financial condition had been such that they could have married earlier in their lives. Pearl, responding to a similar question, said, "Oh, definitely."

Neither Walter nor Pearl stated that s/he had any idea why they had been selected to be interviewed.

The Kirby's response to the word-association

portion of the interview may be displayed as follows:

| Word | Walter's Association | Walter's Value | Pearl's Association | Pearl's Value |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Togetherness | Love | + | Happiness | + |
| Loneliness | Love | - | Cheerfulness | + |
| Intimacy | Love | + | Walter | + |
| Autonomy | Education | + | Understanding | + |
| Separateness | Loneliness | - | Cheerfulness | + |
| Friendship | Love | + | Happiness | + |
| Sex | Love | + | Enjoyment | + |
| Husband | Companion | + | Wife | + |
| Wife | Companion | + | Husband | + |
| Breadwinner | Husband | + | Person | + |
| Homemaker | Wife | + | Enjoyable | + |

Several comments upon the word-association sequence appear noteworthy. After she had responded to "Loneliness" with "Cheerfulness," Pearl said, "Now, you noticed when I [sic] said 'Loneliness,' I don't mind being alone." Pearl initially responded to the word "Autonomy" by saying, "Now, I haven't heard that word lately." The interviewer gave a brief definition, in response to which Pearl said, "Understanding." Walter also asked for, and was given, a brief definition of "Autonomy" before he responded to that word.

3. Couple Three

The third of the subject couples will be called Gus

and Ariel Morgan. Gus's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:3, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 56, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 48. He is thirty-one, the eldest of three children, and has lived in Southern California all his life. He has been married for ten years; this is his first marriage. Ariel and he have two daughters, ages seven and three. He is employed as a sales trainer; he has a Bachelor's degree. He describes his religious beliefs as "moderate" and his political views as "conservative." He views himself as sensitive, adding, "but I camouflage it." He shares in doing housework. He favors the "concept" of Woman's Liberation, but does not like the forms it takes. He describes the Equal Rights Amendment as "bigoted." He has not received psychotherapy.

Ariel's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.1, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 49, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 56. She is thirty-one, the second of three children, and has lived all her life in Whittier. This ten-year marriage is her first, also. She works part-time (between five and fifteen hours each week) as a math tutor; she has a M.Ed. degree. She describes her religious beliefs as "very liberal" and her political views as "conservative." She finds the subject of Woman's Liberation "difficult to comment on" and describes herself as being unfamiliar with the ERA. She has

not received psychotherapy.

When asked, "What's it like to live with Ariel?"

Gus responded,

If you had to say somebody was spontaneous and somebody was more conservative and if you could put your feet in ice water and your head in the oven and had an average, that's what we are. Sometimes we average each other out and sometimes we conflict.

He indicated that Ariel and he often experience discomfort because of her desire for security and his desire to "do something I really enjoy." Ariel's response to the question, "What's it like to live with Gus?" was, "There's never a dull moment. He is moody. He has highs and lows so it's exciting because . . . there is no routine. We're very spontaneous."

In reply to the question, "Why do you suppose you have differences of opinion?" Gus said, "Everybody has a difference of opinion," and Ariel said, "We're different people." Asked how Ariel and he resolved differences, Gus stated,

She doesn't ever say anything. She's not that communicative. She is not that aggressive. . . . She's like that still river that runs very deep, and it looks all calm, but don't mess around with it.

I either laugh about it or kid her, and that makes it worse.

He described a process involving each telling the other what s/he wants and how s/he feels, thus enabling them to reach a compromise. Ariel referred to "long discussions" as their means of resolving differences:

I would normally feel like we come to the best solution for the situation depending on who presents the best arguments, whichever. I think we do a pretty good job of compromising most of the time.

Both responded affirmatively to the question, "Is it okay to feel anger toward your husband/wife?" Neither felt that there was any emotion that s/he shouldn't feel toward the other.

Gus reported that Ariel and he spend approximately forty-five minutes a day together, whereas Ariel stated that they ordinarily spend two hours each evening together. Both described Gus as being very unpredictable. Gus stated, "There is no 'day.' I have never been in a regimented position to have a 'day.'" Ariel said, "We may have dinner and he'll say, 'Hey, let's go to the May Company,' or 'Let's go see some friends.' So we go. . . . It's very different all the time."

Gus reported spending time alone while driving (approximately an hour a day), in his yard, and sitting and thinking in his office. Ariel stated that she takes approximately five hours a week as time to be by herself, usually reading in her bedroom.

Gus said that he spends two to four hours a week with his daughters without Ariel's being present. Ariel stated that she is with her younger daughter all day long (she tutors in her home), and with the older daughter ordinarily after three p.m. She estimated that the four-member

family spends fifteen hours a week together.

Both Gus and Ariel agree that Ariel keeps the family's financial records. The reason for this arrangement, according to Ariel, is: "He doesn't care about money. When he has it, he spends it." Exactly how their book-keeping system works is not clear to this writer. Ariel stated,

Our sort of policy is that if he wants something and he can really convince me, then we do it. . . . I'm usually the one that has to say, "No, we can't afford it. . . ." I have the checkbook; he has Mastercharge and cash.

Gus said, "I came home and said, 'I bought a house today,' and that's okay. . . . I just write a check. Well, I know what's in the savings account." Gus's understanding of the dynamics of Ariel's and his financial arrangement is highlighted by this statement:

She has a conflict there because she feels that she can't spend because I do. . . . She feels cheated. Yeah, I'm sure . . . but that's her problem. . . . She could [spend more money], and if she did it I would have to accept the responsibility that we have a budget, but if she's not going to do it, I don't accept that responsibility.

When asked how his marriage had changed over the years, Gus replied, "It gets better and better all the time." When asked to elaborate, he said,

Well, I don't know. I guess it's like a new pair of shoes. When you buy them, it's all kind of shiny--don't tell her I said that--when you look at them they are all kind of nice and shiny and that's why you buy them . . . and then as you put them on they have a few places that blister here and there. Eventually you develop a blister in that spot and it doesn't bother

you any more [sic]. . . .

As a change in Ariel, Gus mentioned that she had become more able to communicate about problem areas. As a change in himself, he noted that he was more in control of his temper. Ariel stated,

I see that we have matured in our ability to express our feelings. We have matured in our ability to fight constructively. I think we have grown in our understanding of each other. I think that . . . we [have] improve[d] our communication.

As to changes in Gus, Ariel referred to his "maturing and modifying the sharp edges." She stated that she had become more understanding and more effective in her ability to resolve conflicts.

Gus described their frequency of sexual intercourse as being "two or three times a week"--"not often enough," he commented. He did not indicate whether Ariel was orgasmic. He stated that he imagined she participated in intercourse "30 percent of the time out of pure obligation." He stated that she initiated intimate contact "in a loving sense, often; in a sexual sense, not often enough." He expressed complete bewilderment regarding what makes the difference between Ariel's being "sexual" and not being sexual: "I wish I could tell you. I wish you could tell me. . . ." When asked whether Ariel tells him, he replied,

I don't know if she could or not because a lot of times it is not the approach. You get your hand slapped enough times, you realize that you got to be . . . the approach, that doesn't work all the time. Maybe it's me. I don't know.

Ariel stated that Gus and she engaged in sexual intercourse approximately three times a week. She described herself as orgasmic. She stated that there had been a change in the quality of their sex life

probably in my attitude because I feel like he doesn't court, is very blunt, and I, like he says, I have this preconceived notion of exactly how you should preface it and if he doesn't, then I'm not too responsive. . . . He's not as romantic. . . . I respond better when he's romantic and so when he isn't, I'm not as responsive, which is probably something I need to work on more than I need to change him.

Gus described his marriage and his parents' marriage as being "very, very different":

I made a decision that I wasn't going to go through with all that hassle. I was going to make mine be more meaningful, and fortunately I found somebody that had consistent goals.

He stated that his parents' disagreements were never constructive: "a very traumatic situation, on and off, never a major separation, but a good part of the time [it] was fraught with conflict." However, Gus described points of similarity between his marriage and his parents': he stated that Ariel and his mother had similar attitudes toward money (although he added that their temperaments were "a little different"); he likened his attitude toward money to his father's: "I don't think he cares, either."

Ariel described her mother as being "very submissive" to Ariel's father and added, "So I'm sure that's why I'm not. . . . I'm not submissive at all." She described her father as having made decisions regarding the

spending of money. She stated that both her parents were "very thrifty." She summarized, "I think both of us have learned a lot from our parents' marriages. We have analyzed them and obviously I've analyzed my own to say that that's not what I want. . . ." Ariel appeared to give an example of her ability to accept differences when, in response to the interviewer's query as to whether she might be uncomfortable relating to her mother since her mother and she related very differently to their husbands, Ariel replied, "My mother and I get along very well and we're very close."

When asked what he credited for his happy marriage, Gus replied that Ariel and he have a common purpose: the desire for stability. He added that Ariel's and his personalities are complementary. Ariel credited a series of classes she took recently which dealt with the subject of self-fulfillment. She clarified:

The more self-fulfilled you are, the more you don't cling to that other person and you don't need them for all your emotional support and I think that's a super way to be. . . . If you are sufficient within yourself, then you're with that other person because you love them and not because of what they are going to give you.

When asked whether he would like to change anything about his marriage, Gus initially responded in the negative, then, when the interviewer said, "Nothing at all?" replied,

What do I get if I change it? I don't know. It's comfortable now. I don't want to break a new pair of shoes in. Yes, I guess, if I could correct it. I don't know. Who knows?

Ariel said, in response to the question of whether she would like to change her marriage in any way, that she would like "a little better sex life." She also said, "I would wish that I would have dated more [before marrying Gus], but . . . given my personality and my experience at that time, I maybe wouldn't have done it any differently if I went back."

Asked to describe a good wife, Gus initially replied, "I think a wife's a wife." He then personalized his response by saying, "Ariel plays a good role as a wife." He described a good wife as "the administrative head, responsible for the orderly conduct of the home [who] has the responsibility of raising the children." Stating that he preferred that his wife stay at home, he described a good wife as responsible for the home and children and for providing support to her husband. He concluded, "A wife has to do what I get a kick out of." Asked to describe a good husband, he began, "I wish I knew." He then listed as attributes sensitivity, protection of one's wife, supporting and providing for one's wife, and "let[ting] her know that what she's doing is important in what I'm doing and that without it I wouldn't be able to do it."

Ariel stated that a good husband should be loving, understanding, communicative, and should have a good sense of humor. She said that a good wife should have similar attributes, emphasizing that she have a sense of humor.

Asked, "If you had it to do all over again, do you think you'd marry Ariel?" Gus replied, "Yes, but not as soon." To a similar question, Ariel responded, "Yes, I know I would."

When asked why they imagined they had been chosen to be interviewed, Gus and Ariel said,

I think you want people that are different, and I think we are different, so that's what I think. (Ariel)

Either we're getting along or we think we're getting along and we really don't. . . . I had hoped that we were adjusted to married life and each other and were compatible with each other. (Gus)

The Morgans' response to the word-association portion of the interview may be displayed as follows:

| Word | Gus's Association | Gus's Value | Ariel's Association | Ariel's Value |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Togetherness | Two | + | Love | + |
| Loneliness | One | + | Separate | - |
| Intimacy | Sex | + | Closeness | + |
| Autonomy | Me | + | Separate | + |
| Separateness | Apart | + | Necessary | + |
| Friendship | Ariel | + | Loving | + |
| Sex | More | + | Love | + |
| Husband | Dominant | + | Loving | + |
| Wife | Supportive | + | Husband | + |
| Breadwinner | Husband | + | Husband | + |
| Homemaker | Wife | + | Wife | + |

4. Couple Four

The fourth of the subject couples to be described will be called Bill and Connie King. Bill's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:1.6, an Inner Directed Percentile of 45, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 37. He is forty-four, the eldest of four children. He was born and has lived all his life in Whittier. He has been married twenty-three years; this is his first marriage. Connie and he have two children: a son, sixteen, and a daughter, fourteen. He is an executive and part-owner of a manufacturing firm. He has a B.A. degree. He describes his religious beliefs as "moderate" and his political views as "moderate to conservative." The interviewer did not ask Bill whether he considered himself sensitive. He describes himself as sharing in doing housework. Responding to a question about Woman's Liberation, he stated that he agreed on the necessity of women having equal opportunities. When asked his views on the Equal Rights Amendment, he spent some time wrestling with his mixed feelings, indicating that his feelings on the subject could not be described simply as positive or negative. He has not received psychotherapy.

Connie's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2.5, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 52, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 51. She is forty-three, the eldest of three children. She was born in

Iowa and has lived in Southern California for thirty-seven years. This twenty-three-year marriage is her first, also. She is a trained teacher; she has a Master's degree. She does not work outside the home. She describes her religious beliefs as "conservative" and her political views as "moderate." She describes Woman's Liberation as "necessary" and states that she is unfamiliar with the Equal Rights Amendment. She has not received psychotherapy.

When asked what it was like to live with Connie, Bill replied, "Great, most of the time." Connie's response to a similar question regarding living with Bill, was, "Our interests and our values are, I think, almost the same, but our personalities are quite different."

Asked why she supposed she and Bill had differences of opinion, Connie said, "We're both very different. . . . I am quicker in my reactions to things and less patient." Bill acknowledged that Connie's and his personalities are different.

Describing how Connie and he dealt with differences, Bill said,

I'm inclined to . . . want to try not to handle them while people are upset . . . but generally we're able to resolve things through talking about them and compromise.

Connie described herself as being articulate about specific ways in which she chose to deal with a particular situation: "I just say, 'This is the way it's going to be and unless

you are really totally opposed to this, I think this is what we ought to do.'" If she then met with opposition to her suggestion, she stated that she would "barter" for a compromise solution. She summarized, "I don't have tantrums or anything like that, but I do come on a lot stronger than anybody else in the family."

Both Bill and Connie stated that they felt it was permissible to feel anger toward the other. Connie added, "And we have tried to show the kids this, too." Connie said that she didn't know whether there was "any feeling that it is not okay to feel toward Bill." Bill said that "anything that would . . . really be a hurt" would not be "okay to feel toward Connie."

Bill estimated that Connie and he spend approximately an hour and a half together each weekday and somewhat more time together on Saturday and Sundays. Connie estimated their "face to face" time each week to be ten to twelve hours.

Bill stated that he seldom had time alone: "There just isn't [the] time that I'd like to have." Connie stated that she has a great deal of independence and spends her daylight hours engaged in

housework, baking, fixing something good for dinner or for the next day, or working on projects for church or Girl Scouts which are my two big time blocks. Sometimes I'm sewing, doing something that someone has asked that I do. . . . I'm in one club. . . . It's just sort of my own schedule.

Each spends a great deal of time in scouting. Bill is a Scoutmaster, a responsibility that he estimates occupies him for portions of one hundred separate days during the calendar year. Each sees scouting as an important means of being involved in the lives of their children. According to Bill,

Well, right now I guess our lives are pretty hectic . . . but Boy Scouts and Girl Scout ages are only going to come once for our children so I think it's a sacrifice we're both making right now.

Other activities with the children include occasional weekend outings and regular church attendance.

When asked how financial matters were cared for, Bill responded,

I pretty much take care of it--the bill paying and that sort of thing--and I always have done that part of it. But when things were pretty much scraping by, why, she certainly was involved and wanted to be involved, and this probably was the basis for a few arguments or discussions or disagreements.

Each described Connie as having a separate account at a different bank which she uses to care for household expenses; she balances her own checkbook. Bill makes monthly deposits into Connie's account. They use credit cards as a convenience to cut down on the number of checks they write each month. They "mutually discuss" expenses that are unexpected and decide together upon major purchases. Says Connie, "He never has been upset about the way I've spent money."

Asked whether the marriage had changed over the

years, Bill noted that there had been necessary adaptation as the children had grown and acquired different needs and interests. He added, "I think probably we've both mellowed and understand each other a little better." He spoke of each having come to know what he termed, "the ground rules." Connie he described as "improving with age." He stated that he hoped he had become "more practical," adding, "I don't think either of us have really altered our life style that much, at least not suddenly enough so that we could realize it."

Connie spoke of having adjusted to Bill's not having become a teacher (her earlier vocational goal for him), to a less conservative way of handling finances, and to feeling freer dealing with anger in the presence of the children. She spoke of their more recent struggle to allocate as much time as they would prefer to allocate to being with each other. She also mentioned that Bill and she began their family later in their lives than most of their contemporaries and that, when the children were born, they consequently became "disgustingly" focussed on the children. She described herself as having become, with Bill's help, less concerned about the opinions of other people. She described herself as having become less judgmental, more patient, and "much calmer."

Each reported their frequency of sexual intercourse to be twice a week. Connie described herself as orgasmic

and Bill as having been consistently "very, very tender and very compassionate."

Bill described his marriage as being basically dissimilar to his parents' marriage. He views Connie and himself as being definitely more demonstrative in their children's presence. The primary difference he sees between his marriage and his parents' marriage is the difference between his mother and Connie:

[My mother] would be happier with a back seat in many kinds of decisions. . . . Connie is more assertive. . . . I think we maybe are a little more democratic, although that may not be fair to my dad because I don't think my mother wanted . . . as equal a relationship as we have. . . .

Connie described similarities and differences between her marriage and her parents' marriage. Similarities she mentioned include similar values and family structure. Differences she listed are that Bill and she are more open about disagreements and less likely to avoid spending money. She added: "Perhaps in a way the roles were reversed in that . . . my father was the one who was the final word . . . ; my mother sometimes would be an intermediary."

Bill credited Connie's and his "commitment to staying together" and their intention to have "a Christian home" for his happy marriage. Connie spoke of their relationships with their parents, their friends, and their church. She spoke of Bill's and her shared values which she believed had resulted from their youthful involvement

in churches of the same denomination.

Asked what they would like to change about the marriage, both spoke of their desire to have more time together. Bill added that he would like to become a better listener.

Bill described a good wife as being a good mother ("competent . . . conscientious . . . about the kids"), a good cook and a good "bedroom partner," who had "empathy for everybody else." He negatively personalized a good husband as being "one that was a littler better than I am." He added the characteristics of being a good provider, having "the same interests as the children," and having empathy. Connie personalized her description of a good husband, saying that such a person would be "like Bill." She added, "a good companion," someone who "cares about people," who is patient and understanding. She described vividly what she had termed the important traits of unselfishness and accommodation:

If he is . . . the only breadwinner in the home, really all of [the money] is his. He's the one that goes out . . . , puts in the blood, sweat and tears, and I think it takes a lot of unselfishness for a man to say, "This is ours." . . . It's a "we" instead of a "me."

When she was asked to describe a good wife, Connie said, "Play [the tape recording of my description of a good husband] over again." She spoke of a good wife's having love and compassion, of sharing, "caring," of being "willing to . . . not always have yourself as the first priority," of

being able to "be happy with a condition the way it is," and to "find happiness . . . in satisfying the needs of your family."

When asked, "If you had it to do all over again, do you think you'd marry [your spouse]?" Bill and Connie answered:

Bill: Oh, I think I probably would. If I--well, right now, I just couldn't hardly imagine living with anyone else.

Connie: I can't [think of] anyone else that I think would, could live with me after all this time. You know, maybe twenty years ago, but . . . but I think, "Who else would put up with all of this? Who else would?"

Asked why they imagined they had been selected to be interviewed, Bill said, "We speculated about whether we were enough different to be interesting. . . ." Connie referred to not having liked the POI.

The Kings' response to the word-association portion of the interview may be displayed as illustrated on the next page.

| Word | Bill's Association | Bill's Value | Connie's Association | Connie's Value |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Togetherness | Loving | + | Marriage | + |
| Loneliness | Separate | Neutral | Sadness | - |
| Intimacy | Together | + | Love | + |
| Autonomy | Dictator ⁴ | + | Rule | - |
| Separateness | Lonely | Neutral | Emptiness | Neutral |
| Friendship | Together | + | Happiness | + |
| Sex | Love | + | Love | + |
| Husband | Wife | + | Wife | + |
| Wife | Husband | + | Husband | + |
| Breadwinner | Father | + | Father | + |
| Homemaker | Father and Mother | + | Mother | + |

5. Couple Five

The fifth of the subject couples will be referred to as Phil and Rachel Duncan. Phil's POI scores include an Other-Directed Ratio of 1:3.1, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 57, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 53. He is sixty-five, the fourth of five children. He was born in Colorado; he moved to Southern California forty years ago. He has been married thirty-eight years; this is

⁴Bill stated, after he had completed the association portion of the interview and before he made value-judgment responses, that he was not certain that he knew the definition of autonomy. The interviewer then gave him a brief definition of the word.

his first marriage. Rachel and he have two children: a son, thirty-six, who lives in Massachusetts, and a daughter, thirty-three, living in Southern California. He is a retired public utilities executive. His formal education includes a high school diploma and Naval electronics training. He describes both his religious beliefs and his political views as "conservative." He describes himself as sensitive. He helps "not too much" with housework. He has "some doubts" about Woman's Liberation; he is in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. He has not received psychotherapy.

Rachel's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:2, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 48, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 37. She is sixty-five, the third of six children. She was born in Colorado and reports that she moved to Southern California twenty-eight years ago.⁵ This thirty-eight-year marriage is her first, also. She has worked as a cafeteria manager; she does not now work outside the home. Her formal education extended beyond high school and included one year of college. She describes her religious beliefs as "moderate

⁵The disparity between Phil's reporting that he had been in Southern California forty years and Rachel's twenty-eight year figure may be explained by noting that they lived in Central California for a time. Phil includes this time in his figure of forty years; Rachel begins counting her twenty-eight years after they returned to Southern California from Central California.

to conservative" and her political views as "moderate." She reports that Phil "sometimes" shares in the housework. Asked her views on Woman's Liberation, she answered,

I don't think too much of it. I think there's a lot of phases of it that's great, they probably should be recognized for equal jobs, equal pay and that kind of thing, but I still like to have a car door opened for me and be seated at a table when you go out to eat. I like to feel like a woman.

She is knowledgeable about the Equal Rights Amendment and takes a neutral stance concerning it. She has not experienced psychotherapy.

When asked what it was like to live with Rachel, Phil responded, "I think I was very fortunate that [God] made us as compatible as we seem to be." He added that they constructively solved problems, that he knew of no "real hangups," that they had similar interests, and that Rachel helped him "by not never pushing me to make more money or anything like that." Rachel said, "I'm quite sure I couldn't ever live with anybody else. I wouldn't want to."

Asked why he imagined Rachel and he had differences of opinion, Phil replied, "There are several areas where we differ in personality." Rachel stated that Phil and she had not had "drastically different" opinions, explaining, "I guess we both sort of see things in the same light."

Phil vividly described a means Rachel and he employed in resolving differences:

Sometimes I'll go out in my shop and fiddle around for awhile. . . . I guess I tend to freeze up and get quiet after the initial statement, then I just go on about my business and keep quiet . . . then she just waits me out and she's pretty good at figuring out when the time is, and says, "Well, what's the problem?" We sometimes end up laughing about the whole situation.

Rachel's description of conflict resolution follows:

He just doesn't say anything. Sometimes I might maybe want to blow up a little bit but he'd just be quiet so I can't blow up by myself. . . . He very seldom gets mad, but when he happens to get mad I don't think he's ever been real mad at me. He can get pretty mad at other things that happen or something that he does himself that he gets mad at himself, but we don't just fight.

Phil initially responded that he thought it was "okay" to feel anger toward Rachel. He then appeared to contradict himself: "There's very few times I've gotten angry. I think that's wrong." The apparent contradiction may have had to do with his conviction that feeling the emotion of anger is "okay," but that the behavior of "getting angry" is wrong. Rachel's response to the question about anger was, "I think so. Not angry--maybe disgusted." Neither reported that there was any other emotion that it was "not okay" to feel toward the other.

Since his retirement three years ago, Phil reported that he works occasionally for pay, but that his usual schedule allows Rachel and him to spend approximately ten hours a day together. He clarified, reconsidering, that they probably spend two hours together in the mornings and five or six hours together in the evenings. Rachel declined

to estimate the number of hours Phil and she were together: "We're together all the time, it seems like." Phil stated that he was alone approximately six hours a day. Rachel reported that she is not alone often; she did say that she enjoys the one or two nights each month when Phil is at meetings and she is home alone.

When asked about the handling of family finances, Rachel stated that they both write checks and that they keep their checkbook in a specific place so that each knows where it is. Both Rachel and Phil reported that they meticulously keep track of expenses, partly because in the early years of their marriage their income was very limited, and partly because they enjoy keeping such a record. Phil commented, "She kind of looks on it as a budget. I look on it more as accounting." Both report that the making of major purchases follows from mutual decisions. They use charge accounts only occasionally. Phil stated,

I think the only difference we have . . . is what we do about our reserves--that is, what age do we start using our reserves instead of just using the interest or income from it.

When asked whether his marriage had changed over the years, Phil replied,

I think so. I think . . . the first few years we were married we were probably further apart in our personalities. I think over the period of years you can kind of see that we're both moving toward a center line some place, narrowing, I think, probably.

He spoke of the changes that occurred in their relationship

when the children became adults and moved away. He spoke of "a mellowing" that had taken place in Rachel's and his relationship and said, "I think that we're closer together now than we have been previously." He stated that he did not think Rachel herself had changed over the years. He spoke of a change in his own attitude toward his career ("I think being constantly alert to opportunities or to need for study or learning kind of wears you down a little bit in mid-life") and described a time when he was approximately forty-five and suffered from several stress-related physical difficulties to which he responded by placing himself under a physician's care and heeding his advice: "He said, 'You can't do this any more.' You know, you go along . . . , you figure that you're indestructible, but soon you learn how fragile you are."

Rachel stated that her marriage had "gotten better since the kids . . . left home." She spoke of feeling "more free and easy with [her] sex life." The only change she reported in Phil was that "he's retired now and he doesn't have all the burdens of the job on him. . . . He would always be kind of uptight. . . . With the release of all that tension and all, he's more understanding and considerate. . . ." She reported no changes in herself.

Asked about frequency of sexual intercourse, Phil stated, "more than once a week." Rachel's response to the same question was, "At least once a week." Phil remarked,

"I'm satisfied. I don't believe it would be possible for me to have sexual relations with any other woman."

Asked to compare her marriage with her parents' marriage, Rachel stated that the two relationships were "very much the same." She described her parents as faithful, as having few apparent differences, as having clear responsibilities ("Mother ran the house. . . . Dad bought a new 1900 Dodge touring car right after World War I [sic]. . . .") She remembered her parents with affection and empathy: "My dad was a big kidder. . . . They had six kids and they had a harder life than we have. . . . They lived in a comparatively small house . . . at times I'm sure it must have been sort of hard on their sex life."

Phil described his marriage as being very different from his parents' (when Phil was fifteen they separated and later divorced). Phil described his parents as not being demonstrative. He stated that he never heard them argue. When asked why his parents separated, Phil said,

[My father] was a very hard working person, just finally wore him out. . . . There must have been some other incompatibility involved.

My mother was a very restless person. She couldn't stay long in one place and I think that contributed to it.

Asked what she credited for her happy marriage, Rachel said, "The way we treat each other." Responding to a similar question, Phil mentioned Rachel's "even temper and understanding" and added, "I have to accept some credit:

I've worked at it."

Rachel stated that she would not like to change anything about the marriage. Phil commented,

If I hoped to change something I'm afraid I might get my hope and then I wouldn't like it. . . . I'm comfortable.

Phil personalized his description of a good wife, saying, "I think I got a pretty good one." He mentioned the qualities of understanding, compatibility (including sexual compatibility), and acceptance of one's husband (including his earning capacity). He said that a good husband would be "a good deal the same way," and spoke of marriage as a partnership in which the disappointments of each are sympathetically accepted.

Rachel stated that a good husband would be "a loving one first" and listed consideration, understanding and patience as important attributes. She personalized her description of a good wife saying, "I think I'm a good wife." She expressed herself continually in the first person:

I try to be loving. . . . I try to understand his feelings even before my own. . . . I can't say I'm an excellent housekeeper. . . . I'm a pretty good cook. . . . I'm a great mother. . . . I try to be understanding of everybody, but my husband and my kids come first. . . .

Both Phil and Rachel said that they would marry one another again if they "had it to do all over again."

Neither stated that s/he had any idea why they had been chosen to be interviewed.

The Duncans' response to the word-association portion of the interview may be displayed as follows:

| Word | Phil's Association | Phil's Value | Rachel's Association | Rachel's Value |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Togetherness | Respect | + | Phil and I | + |
| Loneliness | [no word] | - | By Myself | - |
| Intimacy | Caring | + | Loving | + |
| Autonomy | Separate | Neutral | [no word] ⁶ | [no value] ⁶ |
| Separateness | Autonomy | Neutral | Alone | Neutral |
| Friendship | Caring | + | Love | + |
| Sex | Gender | + | Phil | + |
| Husband | Wife | + | Great Guy | + |
| Wife | Pair | + | Me | + |
| Breadwinner | Provider | Neutral | Phil | + |
| Homemaker | Provider | Neutral | The Duncans | + |

6. Couple Six

The sixth of the subject couples will be called Joe and Deborah Scott. Joe's POI scores include an Other-
Inner Directed Ratio of 1:4.5, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 57 and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 53. He is forty-three, an only child, and was born in Northern California. He has lived in Southern California for twenty-four years. Deborah and he have been married seventeen

⁶Rachel commented that she did not know the definition of "Autonomy."

years; this is his first marriage. He has two children: a son, twelve, and a daughter, nine. He is a physician; he has an M.D. degree. He describes himself religiously as an agnostic and states that his political views are "conservative." He states that he is "probably not" sensitive; he qualifies that evaluation by saying that he is sensitive towards his wife. He shares "some" in the housework. As to his views on Woman's Liberation, he states that he is in favor of "equal pay." He describes himself as being unfamiliar with the Equal Rights Amendment. He has not received psychotherapy.

Deborah's POI scores include an Other-Inner Directed Ratio of 1:1.6, an Inner-Directed Percentile of 44, and a Capacity for Intimate Contact Percentile of 32. She is thirty-nine, the second of three children. She was born in Whittier and has lived in Southern California all but two years of her life. This seventeen-year marriage is her first also. She works one day a week as a dental hygienist "to keep [her] hands in [her] profession"; she has a bachelor's degree. She describes both her religious beliefs and her political views as "conservative." She states that Joe shares "not too much" with the housework. She states that she is unfamiliar with both Woman's Liberation and the Equal Rights Amendment. She has not had psychotherapy.

Asked, "What's it like to live with Deborah?" Joe replied, "It's pretty good. I don't think it would be much

better with anybody else." Deborah's response to a similar question was, "Well, we're quite opposite in temperament." She amplified:

He doesn't go out at night with the boys and he's always home and he always calls me once or twice a day . . . and he's very quiet which is good for me because I'm the total opposite. I'm very, sort of compulsive--have to get things done right now, and he's totally relaxed, which is good, I suppose: calms me down.

Asked whether they had differences of opinion, Deborah replied, "We pretty well are in agreement so we really get along very well." Joe stated that there were differences of opinion between Deborah and him because "two persons living in the same household cannot avoid having differences of opinion."

Asked how they dealt with differences, Deborah described herself as occasionally becoming silent and said of Joe, "He's very honest. He'll tell you what he thought." Joe said, "Probably one gives a little bit and the other one gives a little bit, and we do more or less the same: what we probably were going to do anyway."

Both Joe and Deborah said that it was "okay" to feel anger toward the other; neither could think of "any way that it [was] not okay to feel" toward the other.

Joe stated that he and Deborah usually spend some time together during the evenings:

I just don't like to go out. I have to get up early. We go to bed fairly early. I usually stay up until about eleven and Deborah goes to bed anywhere from nine o'clock on. . . . [We] talk, I read, Deborah does

needlepoint, nothing very exciting. . . . We usually talk and watch TV.

Once each year Joe reported that Deborah and he take a vacation trip without their children (they also take an annual vacation trip with the children). Deborah, speaking of an average weeknight, said, "We maybe have an hour or two to ourselves, perhaps." When asked how he managed to have time by himself, Joe said, "Deborah manages it. . . . She knows that I require a certain amount of time by myself, reading; she manages to see that I have time alone." Deborah stated that she was able to have several hours a day by herself while the children were in school. Both Joe and Deborah spend time with their children; Joe's time with his children usually takes place on weekends when he is not "on call."

When asked how they handle financial matters, Deborah stated that she has a checking account from which she pays all "bills that come into the house" or "whatever [she needs] money for," and that they have another account from which Joe writes checks for house payments and insurance premiums. Both accounts are joint accounts; they do not write checks on "each other's accounts." Joe replenishes Deborah's account when she notifies him that its balance is low. She mentioned that they have savings accounts for the children and a retirement plan account: "all sorts of things like that . . . which most everybody does, I am sure, that has any sense: some kind of plan for the

future." Deborah made the following comments--apparently somewhat contradictory:

Major big purchases for the home we discuss and buy it if we like it, but as far as other little things: like he bought a motorcycle. . . .

He might come in perhaps with a new car, surprise me. Some big major things like a car that he wants, he'd buy without asking me about it.

Deborah also stated that she "would feel quite free to go out and spend quite a bit of money on clothes if [she] wanted to." She summarized: "We don't have any money problems."

Joe stated that he paid credit card bills from his account. He added, "It gets very involved because I have business accounts and corporate accounts. . . . I have several different accounts. . . ." He described Deborah as spending money on herself "rarely."

When asked how his marriage had changed over the years, Joe replied,

Oh, I'm sure it's matured. Little things that might have upset one or the other of us, we don't even bother with mentioning any more. We just pass it off and go on. . . . The little differences of opinion that may have bothered you at one time don't any more. It's not worth getting upset about.

He stated that he had not noticed any changes in Deborah. When asked about changes in himself, he said,

I try not to let little things bother me because in my work I have to make fairly crucial decisions at infrequent intervals that are awfully simple or simply awful, and so I just don't like to get upset about little things. It's not worth the effort. I don't need that kind of stress. I probably learn to live with it better

that way: the little things don't bother me.

Deborah commented upon the "new dimensions" that her children have brought to her marriage. She spoke of Joe as having become very confident in his profession and as being "very happy": "He's gone from an intern to a very self-assured, successful physician and I suppose family man to his children. . . ." The changes she was aware of in herself had to do with the effects that being a mother have had upon her.

Each reported that their frequency of sexual intercourse is once a week, that Deborah is orgasmic, and that their sexual life together is satisfactory to both.

Joe stated that his parents' marriage is "probably fairly similar" to his own. He spoke of there being few disagreements between his parents and that his parents handled finances in ways similar to the ways Deborah and he employed. When asked whether his parents were demonstrative, Joe replied, "Fairly. We [sic] try to, but I think we try to be fairly demonstrative to our children. I don't know about being demonstrative between ourselves. . . ."

Deborah said, contrasting her marriage to her parents' marriage, "In many ways, it's probably the same." Her parents' marriage she described as being "very calm." She stated that only once could she remember them arguing. She likened her husband to her father, describing both as highly dependable and "very quiet." She stated that her

parents handle financial matters in a manner similar to the methods Joe and she employ. When asked whether her parents were demonstrative, she replied,

The kids are always hanging on [Joe] and kissing him and stuff, but I would say as far as [my father] and my mother, well, if he's been out and comes back from golfing, he gives her a kiss . . . so maybe he's more demonstrative.

When asked what he credited for his satisfactory marital adjustment, Joe said, "We give and take from each other." Deborah's response to the same question was, "You've got to be able to give to the other person."

Joe stated that he did not want to change anything about his marriage. Deborah expressed the desire for "maybe a little more time together."

Joe described a good wife as "a good partner in any endeavor," adding, "It encompasses a whole range of things, from emotional to monetary." When asked to describe a good husband, he said, "The same thing, and somebody who can be a partner, do things that might not necessarily be considered a part of his role . . . without considering it demeaning. Um, a partnership."

Deborah personalized her description of a good husband by saying, "I think I've got one, fortunately." She spoke of the importance of a good husband's "caring" about and "taking care of" his wife. Other attributes of a good husband she listed were: "a good family man, good to children," successful in his profession, a good example for his

children, "fun to be with," intelligent, "a good conversationalist," having common interests with his wife, coming home every night, dependability, and "love, of course." A good wife, she said, is a good housekeeper: "I can't imagine a man coming home and putting up with a slovenly home. This is important: to have things really perfect." Other attributes of a good wife that Deborah listed are: that she raise "responsible children," that she be a good cook and a "nice hostess," and that she "encourage her husband's interests."

Both Joe and Deborah stated unequivocally that they would marry each other again if given the opportunity. Deborah elaborated, "[I've] never had a regret."

When asked why she imagined she had been chosen to be interviewed, Deborah replied, "Probably because our opinions on the poll were so completely opposite. . . ." She quoted herself as having commented to Joe, "We are so totally opposite." Joe's response to the same question was:

Probably . . . if you read the written answers, there would be some things that were not necessarily the answers that the average person would give.

He went on to speak of the differences between himself and Deborah: he described Deborah as "lov[ing] everybody" and acknowledged that he was a more private person.

The Scott's response to the word-association portion of the interview may be displayed as follows on the next page.

| Word | Joe's Association | Joe's Value | Deborah's Association | Deborah's Value |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Togetherness | One | + | Happy | + |
| Loneliness | Sorrow | - | Sad | - |
| Intimacy | Love | + | Warm | + |
| Autonomy | Singular | Neutral | Good | +7 |
| Separateness | Apart | - | Good | + |
| Friendship | Love | + | Important | + |
| Sex | Joy | + | Warm | + |
| Husband | Wife | + | Half of the Team | + |
| Wife | Partner | + | Other Half of the Team | + |
| Breadwinner | Money | -8 | Husband | + |
| Homemaker | Wife | Neutral | Me | + |

C. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the study's six subject couples in some detail. In the following chapter the material contained in this chapter will be analyzed and findings explicitly related to the study will be presented.

⁷Before giving a value association to the word, "Autonomy," Deborah asked for and was given a definition of the word as follows, "Autonomy could be 'ability to stand on one's own feet.'"

⁸Of the term, "Breadwinner," Joe commented, "I don't like that word."

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

In this chapter the data presented in Chapter Four will be analyzed, organized and presented in such a manner that marriages characterized by high levels of autonomy on the part of both spouses and a high degree of intimacy are exemplified and contrasted with marriages demonstrated not to be characterized by high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy. The divisions of the chapter include A) Validity of Provisional Classifications, B) Presentation of Modified Classifications, C) The "High-High" Marriage Exemplified, and D) The "High-High" Marriage Contrasted.

A. VALIDITY OF PROVISIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

The validity of the provisional "High-High" and "High-Low" classifications given to each couple¹ will be tested by comparing the assembled data with portions of this study's normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy.²

1. Autonomy

Three means of establishing whether subjects exhibit

¹Rationale for the provisional classifications is given on pp. 81-83.

²The normative definitions are stated on pp. 75 and 76.

high levels of personal autonomy as autonomy is defined in this study will be employed.³

a. The definition of autonomy includes the phrase, the combined qualities of self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction and . . . the placing of a high value upon the self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction of others.

In the light of this phrase, it could be predicted that autonomous persons would respond positively to the question, "Do you ever have differences of opinion?" In fact, of the twelve subject individuals, only Rachel Duncan of Couple Five and Deborah Scott of Couple Six did not give completely positive responses to this question. Both Mrs. Duncan and Mrs. Scott are "lower scoring partners."

b. In the light of the second portion of the phrase cited above under "a.," it could be predicted that subjects would respond to the question, "How would you describe a good [spouse]?" by listing attributes of a good spouse rather than by giving a role description since the listing of attributes allows for more recognition of individuality than does the giving of a role description. In fact, as is displayed in Table 1 on the next page, the husband of Couple Three, Gus Morgan, responded to the question with a role description and no listing of attributes. Those who

³The three lower scoring partners--Bill King of Couple Four, Rachel Duncan of Couple Five, and Deborah Scott of Couple Six (see pp. 86 and 87) may be expected not to exhibit a high level of personal autonomy.

responded with role descriptions as well as attributes are Walter Kirby of Couple Two, Bill King of Couple Four (a lower scoring partner) and Deborah Scott of Couple Six (a lower scoring partner). These findings would appear to substantiate the lower personal autonomy ratings of Bill King and Deborah Scott and to raise some question as to the high level of personal autonomy of Walter Kirby and, especially, Gus Morgan.

Table 1. Responses to "How would you describe a good spouse?"

| | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Couple One | Roy Holmes Janet Holmes | Listing of attributes only Listing of attributes only |
| Couple Two | Walter Kirby Pearl Kirby | Role description and listing of attributes Listing of attributes only |
| Couple Three | Gus Morgan Ariel Morgan | Role description only Listing of attributes only |
| Couple Four | *Bill King Connie King | Role description and listing of attributes Listing of attributes only |
| Couple Five | Phil Duncan *Rachel Duncan | Listing of attributes only Listing of attributes only |
| Couple Six | Joe Scott *Deborah Scott | Listing of attributes only Role description and listing of attributes |

*Lower scoring partners

c. The definition of autonomy includes the terms, "independence, self-support, [and] self-direction." In the light of these terms, it could be predicted that subjects would so structure their days that they would spend time by themselves. Only Bill King of Couple Four (a lower scoring partner) did not report regularly taking time to be alone. This datum appears to support the provisional classification

of Mr. King as having a lower level of personal autonomy.

2. Intimacy

Five means of establishing whether subjects exhibit high capacities for intimacy as intimacy is defined in this study will be employed.⁴ Since intimacy is defined relationally, focus in this section will be upon couples rather than upon individuals.

a. The definition of intimacy places intimacy in the context of a relationship between two persons "who regard one another as equals." In the light of this phrase, it could be predicted that subjects would not respond, in the word-association portion of the interview, to the words "husband" and "wife" with clearly unequal terms. In fact, Gus Morgan of Couple Three responded to "husband" with "dominant" and to "wife" with "supportive." This apparently explicit indication of an unequal view of self and spouse raises a question as to the degree of intimacy exhibited in the Morgans' marriage.

b. The definition of intimacy characterizes the intimate relationship as including "warm mutual regard, deep friendship, and mutual cherishing." In the light of these terms, it could be predicted that subjects would refer to their spouses in positive terms considerably more often than

⁴The three lower scoring partners may be expected not to exhibit a high capacity for intimacy.

they would refer to their spouses in negative terms. A tabulation was made from interview transcripts of positive and negative references to spouse. Table 2 displays the results. Only Gus Morgan referred to his spouse in negative terms more often than in positive terms. The responses of Ariel Morgan, Rachel Duncan (a lower scoring partner), Joe Scott, and Deborah Scott (a lower scoring partner) may be considered to be mixed. This data bring into question whether either the Morgan or the Scott marriage corresponds to this study's definition of intimacy. Rachel Duncan's apparent confirmation as a "lower scoring partner" would appear to raise some question as to the intimate nature of her marriage.

Table 2. References to spouse.

| | | Positive References | Negative References | Classification |
|--------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Couple One | Roy Holmes | 11 | 0 | Highly Positive |
| | Janet Holmes | 5 | 0 | Positive |
| Couple Two | Walter Kirby | 7 | 1 | Positive |
| | Pearl Kirby | 3 | 0 | Positive |
| Couple Three | Gus Morgan | 5 | 8 | Negative |
| | Ariel Morgan | 5 | 4 | Mixed |
| Couple Four | *Bill King | 4 | 1 | Positive |
| | Connie King | 10 | 3 | Positive |
| Couple Five | Phil Duncan | 7 | 2 | Positive |
| | *Rachel Duncan | 2 | 2 | Mixed |
| Couple Six | Joe Scott | 2 | 2 | Mixed |
| | *Deborah Scott | 10 | 6 | Mixed |

*Lower scoring partners.

c. The study's definition of intimacy states, "Persons who experience intimacy in their relationship tend to consider themselves accountable to one another. . . ." In the light of this statement, it could be predicted that intimate relationships would have developed effective processes for conflict resolution, and, therefore, that subjects' responses to the question, "How do you handle . . . differences?" would reflect the development of such processes. The responses of Rachel Duncan and Deborah Scott, who had denied that their husbands and they had differences,⁵ were not analyzed. Of the ten subjects whose responses were analyzed, only Gus Morgan of Couple Three appeared not to employ effective problem-solving techniques. His comment, "I either laugh about it or kid her, and that makes it worse," describes a method of responding to conflict that is admittedly counter-productive. This datum adds further question as to the intimate nature of the Morgan marriage.

d. The statement regarding mutual accountability cited in the paragraph above could enable us to predict that subjects would have developed a clear understanding with their spouse regarding how financial matters are to be handled. The Morgans' responses left doubt as to whether they do in fact consult each other regarding the making of major purchases and whether in fact they each have the same

⁵See 1., a. above on page 141.

understanding of how financial matters are to be handled.⁶ This response casts further doubt upon the intimacy of the Morgans' marriage.

e. Upon the premise that persons who are truly intimate will be able to form close, comfortable associations with other persons under conducive conditions, the interviewer re-read the interview transcripts and analyzed his own feelings in an admittedly subjective and not necessarily reliable attempt to gauge subjects' degree of comfort with the interview process and the apparent degree to which they formed a close relationship with him. The results are displayed in Table 3. Couples One and Two demonstrated high

Table 3. Interviewer estimations of subject willingness to form a close, comfortable association.

| | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Couple One | Roy Holmes Janet Holmes | High willingness High willingness |
| Couple Two | Walter Kirby Pearl Kirby | Moderate to high willingness High willingness |
| Couple Three | Gus Morgan Ariel Morgan | Very low willingness Low to moderate willingness |
| Couple Four | *Bill King Connie King | Low to moderate willingness Moderate willingness |
| Couple Five | Phil Duncan *Rachel Duncan | Moderate willingness High willingness |
| Couple Six | Joe Scott *Deborah Scott | Low willingness Low to moderate willingness |

*Lower scoring partners

⁶See above, p. 109.

willingness to form a close, comfortable relationship with the interviewer, thereby enhancing their credibility as having an intimate relationship with each other. Couples Four and Five displayed moderate willingnesses to form a close, comfortable relationship with the interviewer. Couples Three and Six demonstrated low willingnesses to form a close, comfortable relationship with the interviewer, thereby raising some question as to the intimate nature of their relationships with each other.

3. Analysis of Data

This section will draw conclusions regarding the validity of the provisional classifications: "High-High" and "High-Low."

The evidence completely supports the classification of Couple One, Roy and Janet Holmes, as exemplifying this study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy. On none of the established indices did they--individually or as a couple--fail to show themselves to be autonomous and intimate.

The evidence supports the classification of Couple Two, Walter and Pearl Kirby, as exemplifying this study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy. The one indication to the contrary concerns Mr. Kirby's capacity for personal autonomy and is listed under 1., b. above.⁷ This one indication is not considered sufficient of itself to affect the

⁷Page 142.

Kirby's classification, since, in none of the other classifications, did the Kirbys fail to show themselves to be autonomous and intimate.

Couple Three, Gus and Ariel Morgan, are clearly judged by the evidence not to exemplify this study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy. Mr. Morgan's capacity for personal autonomy is questioned by his failure to describe a good wife in any way other than through role description.⁸ In the case of neither of the Morgans does the person's behavior exemplify this study's definition which states in part:

autonomy refers to . . . the placing of a high value upon the self-awareness, independence, self-support, and self-direction of others. It is characterized by . . . the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint. . . .⁹

The intimacy level of the Morgan marriage is conclusively shown not to be high by the material in 2., a., b., c., d., and e.¹⁰

The data support the classification of Bill King of Couple Four as a lower scoring partner. His lower rating in personal autonomy is confirmed in 1., b. and c. Although little information other than that contained in 2., e. gives conclusive evidence that Mr. King's marriage is lacking in

⁸See pages 141 and 142.

⁹Page 75.

¹⁰See pages 143-147.

intimacy, our definition of intimacy makes reference to the phenomenon's occurring "between two autonomous persons" and, since Mr. King's level of autonomy is low, the conclusion that his marriage's intimacy level is less than high is inescapable.

The data support the classifying of Connie King as exemplifying this study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy. Again, however, the fact that her husband's level of personal autonomy is lower brings into question the intimacy level Mrs. King experiences in her marriage since, by definition, the experience of intimacy occurs "between two autonomous persons."

The data do not completely support the classification of Rachel Duncan of Couple Five as a lower scoring partner. The only confirmatory evidence is contained in 1., b. above--and it is mild in nature--and in 2., b.--which, again, is not conclusive. Evidence of a high capacity for intimacy is contained in 2., b. (Mrs. Duncan was judged by the interviewer as exhibiting a high willingness to form a close, comfortable relationship).

The data support the classifying of Phil Duncan as exemplifying the study's definitions of autonomy and intimacy.

The data support the classification of Deborah Scott of Couple Six as a lower scoring partner. Her lower capacity for personal autonomy is confirmed by 1., a. and b., and

2., b. suggests that her capacity for intimate contact is lower in level.

Joe Scott's level of personal autonomy is not questioned by the data. His capacity for intimate contact, however, is called into question by 2., b. and e. The Scott marriage appears not to feature

each person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship."¹¹

B. PRESENTATION OF MODIFIED CLASSIFICATIONS

For the purpose of this study it is necessary to identify "marriages of persons who have high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy"¹² so that such marriages can be exemplified and contrasted with other marriages. This study had provisionally constructed "High-High" marriages, in which both spouses exhibited high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy, and had designated Couples One, Two, and Three as being "High-High."

The validation analysis detailed above enables the confirmation of Couple One and Couple Two as "High-High." These two couples will be used to exemplify marriages of

¹¹Page 76.

¹²Page 2.

persons having high levels of personal autonomy and high capacities for intimacy.

The validation analysis above enables the probable reclassification of Couple Five as a "High-High" couple. The slightly mixed nature of the data, however, together with the POI scores of one of the couple, force the exclusion from further consideration of Couple Five since that couple does not provide unquestioned exemplification of, nor contrast with, the "High-High" marriage.

The validation analysis appears to validate the "High-Low" classification of Couple Four. There are clear differences between this couple and the two "High-High" couples. Couple Four can be utilized in providing contrast with the "High-High" couples.

The validation analysis does not provide a clear confirmation of Couple Six's being a "High-Low" couple. The data would appear, instead, to favor a reclassification of the couple as "Low-Low." The couple clearly contrasts with the two "High-High" couples.

The validation analysis leaves no doubt that Couple Three should be reclassified as "Low-Low." The data are clear and unequivocal, and enable the confident designation of the couple as standing in contrast with the "High-High" couples.

Couple One and Couple Two, then, will exemplify the highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage. Couples

Three, Four, and Six will be cited as contrasting with Couples One and Two. Couple Five will be excluded from further discussion.

C. THE "HIGH-HIGH MARRIAGE EXEMPLIFIED

The "High-High" marriage, characterized by high levels of autonomy on the part of both spouses and a high degree of intimacy, will be exemplified in nine ways.

1. The couples report a high degree of satisfaction with their marriage. Initial, immediate responses to the question, "What's it like to live with [your spouse]?" follow.

Oh, I quite honestly am tickled pink. (1M)¹³

Oh, well, it makes me feel happy. . . . I'm very happy and very satisfied with my life. (1F)

Well, it's like California sunshine. Sunshine everyday. It's beautiful. (2M)

Wonderful. To tell the truth, we're best friends, really. . . . (2F)

2. The couples give indications that they like their children. Roy Holmes (1M) spoke of enjoying being with his stepchildren and of his occasional jealousy of their natural father:

I get jealous if he gets a helluva lot of attention

¹³"1M" designates the male member of Couple One; "1F" designates the female member of Couple One. This shorthand means will be employed to refer to other couples as well--e.g., "2M."

that I'd love to have. I feel like I get a lot of the dirty work of raising them. They're really nice kids and they also give a lot back to me.

Janet Holmes (1F) described herself as "very family-oriented" and reported spending time talking with her children, learning their opinions, sharing her opinions with them, and urging them to develop and cherish their individuality.

Walter Kirby (2M), whose daughter is grown and lives in another state with her husband and children, spoke of having enjoyed her and her friends "to the fullest";

I played badminton with them. I was just one of the gang, but . . . they had respect for me and they had to toe the line. They couldn't get out of hand, but there were times when they pulled little pranks on us that I had to laugh. . . .

Pearl Kirby (2F) told of her daughter's decision, shortly after she became an airline stewardess, to share a house with four other stewardesses. After she had lived there for one week, the daughter returned to her apartment in her parents' house and was eventually followed there by three of the women she had begun to share the house with. Pearl added,

And three of those girls still call me "Second Mamma" because they could come down and talk, and they said they never had been able to talk out like [that] at home.

3. The couples place high premiums upon the achievement of sexual satisfaction. Janet Holmes' (1F) statement is especially relevant:

I would not marry someone who was not a good lover. . . . I think that is probably one of the most important parts of the marriage. . . . It's not being a self-oriented person; it's waiting for me to achieve satisfaction in my sexual relationship. That's what I see as a good lover. My first marriage I was very unhappy sexually and I would not consider my husband a good lover. I never achieved an orgasm and with Roy, just almost every time, and I had decided that I would not marry someone who was not a good lover because I think that reflects in so many other ways, your attitudes toward the person.

Roy Holmes (1M) described his wife as "a good lover" and "orgasmic," and spoke of himself as being "very much" satisfied with their sexual relationship.

Walter Kirby, although concerned about his ability to perform sexually--he had described their frequency of coitus as "about once a week and we are lucky to get that"--said,

We enjoy sex to the fullest. We both do. . . . There's no inhibitions, either of us. We're very open with each other. We tell each other what we enjoy and what we don't enjoy. We tried pleasing the other one. I just can't imagine a man forcing a woman, his wife or anyone else. I just can't imagine. I can't see how there could be any satisfaction in it. To me, she's got to enjoy it. I try everything so she enjoys it. She does everything I enjoy.

Pearl Kirby (2F) reported feeling "definitely, definitely" happy and satisfied with her sexual relationship with Walter and remarked that she attributed his difficulties with sexual performance to his age and work schedule and indicated that she believed Walter's performance will become less of a problem when he retires in two years.

4. The couples place a high value upon sexual

fidelity. One attribute of a good husband Janet Holmes (1F) listed was sexual fidelity. Walter Kirby (2M) offered,

I could never, I mean, I got so much respect for her and she's just so wonderful I couldn't hurt her, like different guys say, "How come you don't step out. . . ?" I never could hurt her that way.

5. The couples structure their relationships in relatively traditional ways. In both marriages the husband is the principal wage earner (in Couple Two the husband is the only wage earner). In both marriages the wife assumes or assumed primary responsibility for child rearing and for housekeeping. None expressed unqualifiedly positive views of Woman's Lib--although all expressed support of women receiving equal pay for equal work. Janet Holmes (1F) commented,

I would like the husband in my family to be in charge. I do not enjoy being in control of things. I would like to have a say in what happens, but I would not want to be responsible for my family. I would rather my husband be the person who was responsible for supporting us and for disciplining the children, and for making the major decisions.

When pressed, she described her husband as "more responsible at making financial decisions." When the interviewer then asked, "Because he's a man?" she said, "No, because he's a very responsible, intelligent person, more capable of making those decisions than I am. . . ."

6. Both husbands report that they talk with their wives about their work. Roy Holmes (1M) said, "I have no compunction about coming home and talking to her about my

work, and a lot of times I listen to her advice. . . ."

Walter Kirby (2M) spoke of sharing his day with his wife when he returns home each afternoon.

7. The three members of the couples who work outside the home describe their work as stressful. Walter Kirby said, "I've worked hard. It's a hard job. The young people don't want to go into it because it is a hard, dirty job and they would rather take less pay and not have as dirty a job, and heavy." Roy Holmes (1M) spoke of his work as "about as high pressure as they come," adding that he often came home feeling "really edgy." Of her husband and herself, Janet Holmes (1F) said, "We both work in such tremendous, people-oriented, pressure jobs. . . ."

8. The couples exhibit a marked ability to adjust to changes in both their corporate and individual lives. Roy Holmes (1M) spoke of his two years of psychotherapy as being of significant help to him in "find[ing]" himself. He spoke of the adjustment involved in marrying a divorcée with two children: "It just 'became.' That the way it had to be, so we made adjustments we had to make."

Janet Holmes (1F) spoke of the breaking up of her first marriage and her adjustment:

I went through this tremendous period of guilt, tremendous guilt: What did I do wrong? And I ended up going to family counseling, ended up taking my kids to family counseling, and I found that, you know, I wasn't doing anything wrong. The only thing wrong that I had done was to marry this person that I'd thought he was. . . . I don't think he knew who he was when he got married, and I think he's still finding out.

She reported a marked degree of success in structuring the family so that the children relate to Roy as father-in-residence (they spend one weekend a month and some holidays with their natural father).

The major adjustment the Kirbys (2M and 2F) had to make would appear to center around Pearl's chronic illness. The illness meant, among other things, that Pearl could not work outside the home and that she could not have more children. It also meant that her life expectancy was uncertain and bleak; according to Walter, she was told when she was twenty-seven that she would not live to be thirty. Walter's adjustment to the illness has been described in Chapter IV, p. 101. Pearl's adjustment is more difficult to describe in the light of her reticence to discuss the illness. Her word-association response to "loneliness" with "cheerfulness," together with her remark, "I don't mind being alone," seem noteworthy. She spoke of not regretting the illness and stated that she believed Walter worried more about it than she did.

Another adjustment Walter Kirby made had to do with his attempt some years ago to open a woodworking shop:

It was the fault of a company in Chicago. I ordered \$3,000 worth of merchandise and they sent me the wrong stuff and when I sent it back they refused shipment on it. . . . If I had looked first [at the freightyard] and refused shipment, then they would have been stuck with it, but I accepted it and then I opened it. The wife wanted me to take out a bigger mortgage and stay in, and I said, "No." No way would I do that and jeopardize what we worked so hard for, so I went back to

the shop and I've been there ever since.

9. The couples have developed highly individualistic and apparently effective means of conflict resolution. Roy Holmes (1M) stated that his initial means of dealing with conflict is withdrawal:

We both pull back and take a look at it and maybe it'll come up again some other time and we'll both be more willing to talk about the possibility that there was more than one position involved. It seems to work out.

This method would appear to be especially effective for Roy in view of his tendency to project anger onto Janet:

I have times when I get up in the morning and I'm just irritated with the driving and things like that and everything gets blown out of proportion or something and I'll be very mad by the time I get to the office. It may even be the fact that I'm just mad about going to the office but it's coming out in my thinking about her. . . .

This sort of projected anger, Roy reports, he is usually able to evaluate and dissipate without needing to tell Janet about it.

Janet Holmes (1F) stressed the importance of accepting differences and the value of compromise as a means of dealing with those conflicts that required resolution. She, like Roy, spoke of deferring discussion of emotion-laden issues until they could be dealt with "on a rational level."

Both Janet and Roy expressed appreciation for one another's individuality. Janet said,

I enjoy a degree of independence, but I would not like to be by myself. I like to be encouraged in what I am

interested in. . . . I think [the children] have to be brought up this way. . . . They have to learn to respect each other's privacy and property and hobbies and friends. We work on this a lot. I think our whole attitude is, whatever is best for the development of the individual, in our house. Also, that development has to fit into our family unit. The business of . . . having one member of the family having control over the other members is something that we don't allow in the house.

Roy's pleasure underlies these remarks he made:

Has our marriage changed? I think it's better now than when we first got married. She had a lot of feelings that she had to work out and I was still working out some things about myself and I think we've both grown so that we're more secure. She's actually blossomed. I'm really kind of tickled because she's so much more stable, sure, secure, assertive [a] person than she was when we got married, and for that matter I feel I am too.

Roy credited his happy marriage to the fact that Janet and he "had gone through [their] college and post-college adjustment":

[We] were beginning to find ourselves as people in the adult world. We found that we liked each other. . . . We were very close to finding ourselves and getting married was kind of like the frosting on the cake.

Walter and Pearl Kirby (2M and 2F) appeared to exhibit a marked ability to appreciate and accept interpersonal differences. Pearl commented, "I wouldn't want him to parrot what I have to say, and I wouldn't definitely want to parrot what he has to say." Regarding a discussion of political candidates, she reported,

Walter can't see where I feel that way, but I listen to him more and . . . so I suppose I try to change his opinion, but in the end I say, "No, you go ahead and you vote the way you want to and I'll vote the way I want to."

Walter reported that, while Pearl and he often had differences of opinion, it was seldom necessary to resolve them. Examples he cited included choice of political candidates, choice of television programs to be viewed, and how to discipline their daughter. "I think [Pearl's] much easier to get along with than I am," he remarked. Both Pearl and Walter emphasized the importance of treating the other with "respect."

One example of the Kirbys' having different opinions or perceptions has already been given: their attitudes toward Pearl's illness. Three additional examples will now be given. The Kirbys give different accounts of their reasons for moving to California fourteen years ago. Walter said,

Our daughter got married and went to Hawaii and she came back to go to Mayo Clinic and told my wife that she should get out of the cold climate, which already her doctor had told her that she should get out of the cold, so when our daughter was back there, she got my wife convinced that we should move to a warmer climate.

Pearl reported,

My daughter had to come back and go to Mayo Clinic, and she said, "Mother, Dad's always wanted to live in a warmer climate. Why don't you move to California?" and I came home and I said Walter, "We're going to move to California."

Another example of the Kirbys' handling of differences is the issue of Pearl working outside of the home. Walter indicated he knew that Pearl wanted to work outside the home. Pearl indicated that she knew Walter preferred

she not work outside the home. Walter speaks with great appreciation of how important it was that when their daughter came home from school her mother was there to host her friends and in some way chaperone the proceedings. Both Walter and Pearl indicate that Pearl did not work outside the home because of her illness. They spoke very differently about their daughter's choosing to work outside the home. Walter said,

[Our daughter] has a wonderful position at the school, but our granddaughter was here this last summer, and she needs supervision, extremely so, and I told my daughter that and she blew up. We had a regular, quite a hard time this summer consequently.

Pearl said, in response to the question, "How would you describe a good wife?"

What Walter would go for--see, like, in today's world me staying home and everything--another person wouldn't, and what I enjoy another woman wouldn't enjoy, and I . . . think it's marvelous like our daughter now, the only thing we're [sic] against as far as she's concerned is she has this physical problem, but as far as her working at the school, I think, it's absolutely marvelous for her. And just because they raise their children different than we do, but then, times are different too.

A third example of the Kirbys' handling of differences has to do with the delicate subject of who will outlive the other. Walter remarked,

You know, we're both dependent on each other for [companionship]. And she always says, "I wouldn't want to be here," she says, "without you. . . . I couldn't do things alone. I haven't got the strength." So I know it would be awful hard on her. And it'd be hard on me too, as you heard, but I got my health. It could be easier for me to cope with things than it would be for her. But, like I always said, I wish we'd go together.

Pearl said,

I always kid [Walter]. There's a friend of mine whose husband--he and I went out together a few times--and I always say, "If I ever did marry anybody else it would be this 'Hugh,'" and when I was home . . . this summer I stopped to see him, and we think the world of one another, but he's very much in love with his wife and I always say, "Who knows?" . . . Now, I don't know how Walter feels, but I think if you've had a very, very happy marriage and . . . something happens to one of you, I think you have a tendency to want to get married again. I mean, that's my opinion.

It is instructive to contrast the richness and subtleties of the Kirbys' forty-year marriage with the emerging patterns and values of the Holmes' three-year marriage.

The material that has been generated in this section will now be used to form a basis for contrasting "High-High" marriages with marriages of other classifications.

D. THE "HIGH-HIGH MARRIAGE CONTRASTED

The same categories that were used to exemplify the "High-High marriage will now be used to contrast it with other marriages. After these categories have been explored, other areas of difference will be presented.

1. The couples being contrasted with the two "High-High" couples do not report a high degree of satisfaction with their marriage. Both members of Couple Three responded to the question, "What's it like to live with [your spouse]?" with purely descriptive statements which expressed neither satisfaction nor obvious dissatisfaction. The wives of

Couples Four and Six gave purely descriptive responses.

The husband of Couple Four said, "Great--most of the time," and the husband of Couple Six answered, "It's pretty good. I don't think it would be much better with anybody else."

2. The couples being contrasted with the "High-High" couples give indications of liking their children. Couple Four report spending a great deal of time with their children and comment frequently how important it is to enjoy their children. Couple Six also spend a great deal of time with their children. The husband of Couple Six talked often about his role as father when he had been asked about his role as husband, particularly when asked whether he was demonstrative. It is not so clear that Couple Three like their children; neither is it clear that they dislike them.

3. Sexual satisfaction is significantly missing from the marriage of Couple Three. The husband would like more sexual intercourse and is convinced that often his wife participates "out of pure obligation." The wife describes the husband as not courting, being "very blunt," and "not as romantic." Couples Four and Six basically reported satisfaction with their sexual relationship, although the husband of Couple Four spoke of wishing that his wife's needs and his would "run parallel all the time." Couple Six's reported frequency of intercourse of once a week is the least reported by any couple except for the two couples who

are in their sixties. We may summarize that the contrasting couples appear to be less sexually satisfied than do the exemplified couples.

4. The couples being contrasted with the "High-High" couples do not make reference to sexual fidelity. It cannot be assumed that sexual fidelity is therefore unimportant to them; it can be noted that one member of each of the couples exemplified did mention sexual fidelity.

5. Like the exemplified couples, the couples being contrasted structure their relationships in traditional ways. In all marriages the husband is the principal wage earner (in the case of Couple Four the husband is the only wage earner). In all three marriages the wife assumes primary responsibility for child rearing and for housekeeping. None expressed unqualifiedly positive views of Woman's Liberation. All three wives and one of the husbands described themselves as unfamiliar with the Equal Rights Amendment. With respect to familiarity with the ERA, the exemplified couples demonstrated considerable knowledge of the subject.

6. Husbands of couples being contrasted do not report talking with their wives about their work. Wives of these couples do not indicate a desire to talk with their husbands about their work. The wife of Couple Four said,

I wouldn't be bored with him unless he started talking business, but that's, after this many years, just an understanding that we have, so I . . . think it would not hurt him for me to say, "Please don't talk about that. I just think it's boring. . . . "

7. It is not clear that all members of the couples being contrasted who work outside the home think of their work as being stressful. Neither member of Couple Three gave such an indication. The husband of Couple Four spoke of working long hours and seldom getting home as early as he would like, but he did not suggest that he experienced stress. The wife of Couple Six did not mention stress. The husband of Couple Six, however, did refer to the need to desensitize himself in order for him to be effective as a physician.

8. The couples being contrasted exhibit little evidence of having made major adjustments in either their corporate or individual lives. The husband of Couple Six spoke of the marriage having "matured." The wife of Couple Six and both members of Couple Four spoke of the changes that having children and the children's maturing brought about. Both members of Couple Three spoke of the day-to-day changes that occur in their lives as a result of the husband's unpredictability and moodiness. They did not report discomfort; the wife spoke of the "excitement" she experienced.

9. The contrasting couples report a varying array of methods of conflict resolution. Couple Three's methods appear to be counter-productive.¹⁴ Couple Six minimize

¹⁴ See above, p. 145.

differences and refer to the need to "be able to give." Couple Four refer to their different personalities, which they describe as being complementary, as being helpful in resolving differences.

To these nine areas of comparison/contrast, the following areas are added:

10. The contrasting couples tend to think less positively of themselves as spouses. The only persons interviewed who spoke disparagingly of themselves as spouses were the husbands of Couples Three and Four. Asked to describe a good husband, the husband of Couple Three said, "I wish I knew," and the husband of Couple Four responded, "One that was a little better than I am."

11. The contrasting couples tend to be less positive about whether they would marry their spouse "if [they] had it to do all over again." The husband of Couple Three said, "Yes, but not as soon." The husband of Couple Four said, "Probably." The wife of Couple Four said, "I think, 'Who else would put up with all of this?'"¹⁵

12. The contrasting couples are much more likely to report wanting to alter their marriages. Only the husband of Couple Six said that he did not wish to change anything. His wife said, "Maybe a little more time together." The husband of Couple Four said that he would like to have

¹⁵See above, p. 122.

more time with his wife and to be a better listener. His wife said that she wanted to have more time with him. The wife of Couple Three expressed a desire for a "better sex life" and that she had dated more before marrying her husband. The husband of Couple Three was highly ambivalent in his answer to the question "Would you like to change anything about the marriage?": "What do I get if I change it? I don't know."¹⁶ The only one of the members of a "High-High" couple who reported wanting to alter anything about his marriage was the husband of Couple Two who wished something could be done about his wife's health.

13. Contrasting couples all report differing religious beliefs; members of "High-High" couples report similar religious beliefs. This is displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Self-report of religious beliefs.

| | | | |
|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Couple One | Eclectic | Liberal | Similar terms |
| Couple Two | Moderate | Moderate | Same terms |
| Couple Three | Moderate | Very liberal | Differing terms |
| Couple Four | Moderate | Conservative | Different terms |
| Couple Six | Agnostic | Conservative | Different terms |

Couples One and Two are "High-High" couples.
 Couples Three, Four, and Six are contrasting couples.

E. SUMMARY

Couples whose marriages are characterized by high

¹⁶See above, p. 112, for a more detailed quotation.

levels of personal autonomy on the part of both spouses and a high degree of intimacy have been exemplified as reporting a high degree of satisfaction with their marriage, as placing high premiums upon the achievement of sexual satisfaction, as featuring husbands talking with their wives about their work, as describing work done outside the home as stressful, as exhibiting a marked ability to adjust to changes in their lives, and as employing highly individualistic and apparently effective means of conflict resolution.

These "High-High" couples also tend to think positively about themselves as spouses, to express no reservation about whether they would marry their spouse "if [they] had it to do all over again," not to want to alter their marriages, and to describe their religious beliefs in similar terms.

The "High-High" couples join with the contrasting couples in appearing to like their children and in structuring their relationships in relatively traditional ways.

These characterizations of "High-High" couples will be employed in the following chapter in dialogue with material from Chapter II of this study to generate hypotheses and questions for further research.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

This study derived normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy from the writings of Paul Tillich, Herbert W. Richardson, Erik H. Erikson, and Frederick S. Perls. Six subject couples were interviewed in depth and material from their interviews was compared with portions of the definitions. Two couples were thereby designated as high in autonomy and intimacy; three couples were designated as "contrasting couples." "High-High" couples were then characterized.

In this chapter characterizations of highly autonomous and highly intimate marriages which were developed in Chapter V will be utilized dialogically with those portions of Chapter II's normative definitions of autonomy and intimacy that were not used validationally in the first section of Chapter V to establish whether subject marriages were in fact characterized by high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy.

This dialogical material will produce hypotheses and questions for further research.

A. GENERATION OF HYPOTHESES

Characterization 1: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features both partners' reporting

a high degree of satisfaction with their marriage.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of intimacy as featuring

each person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship."

The characterization, however, goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 1: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will produce a high degree of spousal satisfaction with the marriage.

Characterization 2: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features both partners' placing high premiums upon the achievement of sexual satisfaction.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of intimacy cited above under Characterization 1.

It too goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 2: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will result in both spouses' placing high value upon, and investing effort into the achievement of sexual satisfaction.¹

Characterization 3: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features husbands talking with their wives about their work.

This characterization underscores the partial

¹It should be noted that frequent genital sexual expression does not appear to be an essential part of the "High-High" marriage--viz. Couple Two's adaptation to the illness of the wife.

definitions of autonomy as featuring "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy" and "a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness" and the partial definitions of intimacy as featuring "experiencing 'the inmost character' of the other" and "seek[ing] to understand one another more and more fully."

The partial definitions of autonomy cited form the basis for one's willingness to reveal oneself; the partial definitions of intimacy cited are self-explanatory.

Characterization 4: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features spouses who work outside the home describing their work as stressful.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of autonomy as featuring "the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to society." This dialogical relationship is made upon the assumption that the stress reported is the result of demanding work which does "make a contribution to society."

Characterization 5: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage exhibits a marked ability to adjust to changes.

The partial definitions of autonomy which are underscored by this characterization are "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy," "the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint," "the ability to interact with one's environment and make a contribution to

society," and "a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness."

The characterization, however, goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 3: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will cause the development of a marked ability to adjust to changes.

Characterization 6: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features the employment of highly individualistic and apparently effective means of conflict resolution.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of autonomy as featuring "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy," "the determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint," "the experiencing of growth," and "a sense of personal uniqueness and wholeness." These characterizations form the basis for one's being willing to risk revealing oneself and involving oneself in conflict resolution.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of intimacy as featuring

each person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship,"

and "seek[ing] to understand one another more and more fully."

The characterization, however, goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 4: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will enable the effective resolution of conflict.

Characterization 7: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features positive spousal self-concept.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of autonomy as featuring "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy."

The characterization, however, goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 5: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will produce positive spousal self-concepts.

Characterization 8: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features spousal conviction that each would marry the other again "if [they] had it to do all over."

This characterization underscores the partial definition of intimacy as featuring

each person's experiencing "the inmost character" of the other, knowing "that which is ordinarily hidden from public view yet revealed in the closeness and vulnerability of the relationship."

Characterization 9: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features partners' not wishing to alter their marriage.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of autonomy as featuring "the awareness of oneself as trustworthy" and the partial definition of intimacy as featuring the seeking "to understand one another more and more fully."

The characterization, however, goes significantly beyond the material contained in the definitions, and, together with Characterization 8, forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 6: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will cause persons to be pleased with their marriages as they are.

Characterization 10: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features husband and wife espousing similar religious beliefs.

This characterization would appear to underscore the partial definition of autonomy as featuring "the absence of despair" and the partial definition of intimacy as featuring "the experienc[ing] of a transcendent quality in the relationship."

The characterization, however, goes beyond the material contained in the definition and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 7: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will cause persons to evolve compatible faith stances.²

²It is recognized that this wording represents an inference not directly derivable from Characterization 10. The author believes, however, that it accurately reflects the spirit of the "High-High" couples as they were presented in Chapter IV.

Characterization 11: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage features positive regard for the children of the marriage.

This characterization would appear to go beyond the definitions and forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 8: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will enable parents to like their children.

It should be noted, however, that Characterization 11 was found to characterize contrasting couples as well as couples whose marriage was classified as highly autonomous and highly intimate. The hypothesis' value as a predictor of whether a marriage is highly autonomous and highly intimate is therefore suspect. The hypothesis is given because it has confirmatory value.

Characterization 12: The highly autonomous and highly intimate marriage is often structured in relatively traditional ways.

This characterization underscores the partial definition of autonomy as "not imply[ing] nonconformity as an end in itself."

The characterization forms the basis for

HYPOTHESIS 9: In marriage, high levels of personal autonomy and a high degree of intimacy will not produce different marital structures from structures of marriages characterized by lower levels of autonomy and intimacy.

The fact that Characterization 12 characterizes contrasting couples as well as couples whose marriage is highly autonomous and highly intimate lends support to

Hypothesis 9.

B. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Question 1: How is the experiencing of transcendence in a relationship to be studied and evaluated?

Little in the case material enables the answering of this question and, given that the experiencing of transcendence is a part of this study's definition of intimacy, the question is an important one.

Question 2: What would a marriage between two persons each of whom had a high degree of personal autonomy in which a high degree of intimacy was not experienced look like?

Given that autonomy is a necessary prerequisite for intimacy, the question as to whether such persons always form intimate marriages when they marry each other is left unanswered; it can be assumed that they do not. The appearance of such marriages and the degree of marital satisfaction reported by spouses would be important additions to the understanding of the subject.

Question 3: Might it be useful, in any replication of this study, so to define intimacy that autonomy is not its prerequisite?

It is possible so to interpret this study's sources that intimacy is no longer understood to be based upon autonomy. Such an interpretation would enable both autonomy

and intimacy to be theoretically independent of each other and might produce conclusions different from those of this study.

Question 4: Given wider sampling techniques, would the material given in this study as characterizing highly autonomous-highly intimate marriages be verified?

A problem with any exploratory and exemplary study is that it cannot verify itself. Further research could helpfully concentrate upon validation of the characteristics and hypotheses generated.

C. SUMMARY

This study has determined that marriages characterized by high degrees of personal autonomy and a high level of intimacy do exist. The study has characterized the marriages as exhibiting high degrees of spousal satisfaction and has exemplified and contrasted such marriages with other types of marriages. The study has generated hypotheses concerning highly autonomous-highly intimate marriages and has raised questions for further research.

It is the author's conviction that personal levels of autonomy and relational levels of intimacy can be enhanced, especially through the psychotherapeutic process.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the continuing process of conceptualizing marital relationships and will serve as a resource for couples and to counseling

professionals and will clarify and inform churches' understandings of marriage and programmatic efforts to minister to contemporary marriages. Specifically, the author hopes that autonomy may become more generally understood to be a desirable trait, and that pastoral counselors and spokespersons for marriage will emphasize heightened autonomy as a preparation for full intimacy.

D. POSTSCRIPT

Researching and writing this dissertation has been a spiritual pilgrimage for the author. He found himself becoming more sensitized to the theological element--designated by the elusive term transcendence and suggested by the word spirit--as he proceeded. In the end, he emerges with the conviction that his interview questions could have more sharply focussed on these issues. He trusts that his future research and his continued practice of pastoral counseling will reflect his increased theological sensitivity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bales, Robert F. Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1970.

Barker, Roger G. Ecological Psychology: Concepts and Methods for Studying the Environment of Human Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Berkowitz, Leonard (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. 5 vols. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Browning, Don. "Analogy, Symbol, and Pastoral Theology in Tillich's Thought," Pastoral Psychology, XIX: 181 (February 1968), 41-54.

Burgess, Ernest W., and Paul Wallin. Courtship, Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1954.

Buros, Oscar K. (ed.) The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. 2 vols. Highland Park, N J: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Casler, Lawrence. Is Marriage Necessary? New York: Human Sciences Press, 1974.

Clinebell, Howard J., and Charlotte H. Clinebell. The Intimate Marriage. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Cobb, John B., Jr. The Structure of Christian Existence. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

_____. Theology and Pastoral Care. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Compaan, Arlo D. "A Study of Contemporary Young Adult Marital Styles as Found Among a Select Sample of Church-Related Couples." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, School of Theology at Claremont, 1973.

Dahms, Alan M. Emotional Intimacy: Overlooked Requirement for Survival. Boulder, CO: Pruett, 1972.

Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corp., 1959.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. 2d ed. New York: Norton, 1963.

_____. Dimensions of a New Identity: the 1973 Jefferson Lectures in the Humanities. New York: Norton, 1974.

_____. Identity and the Life Cycle (Psychological Issues, Monograph 1) New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

_____. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.

_____. Insight and Responsibility: Lectures on the Ethical Implications of Psychoanalytic Insight. New York: Norton, 1964.

_____. Life History and the Historical Moment. New York: Norton, 1975.

Freud, Sigmund. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, ed. and trans. James Strachey. 24 vols. London: Hogarth Press, 1953.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Hiltner, Seward. Preface to Pastoral Theology. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958.

Iliardi, R. L., and W. T. May. "A Reliability Study of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, VIII: 1 (Spring 1968), 68-72.

Johnson, James Turner. A Society Ordained by God: English Puritan Marriage Doctrine in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Joyce, Sister Mary Ursula, O.P. "An Empirical Investigation of Erikson's Developmental Crises of Ego Identity, Intimacy, and Generativity in Religious Women." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1970.

Kinsler, Philip Joel. "Ego Identity Status and Intimacy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1972.

Klavetter, R. E., and R. E. Mogar. "Stability and Internal Consistency of a Measure of Self-Actualization." Psychological Reports, XXI (August-December 1967), 422-24.

Knapp, Robert R. Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1976.

Kurtines, William. "Autonomy: a Concept Revisited." Journal of Personality Assessment, XXXVIII: 3 (June 1974), 243-46.

Mace, David and Vera. We Can Have Better Marriages. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974.

Marcia, James E. "Determination and Construct Validity of Ego Identity States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.

McClain, E. W. "Further Validation of the Personal Orientation Inventory." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXV: 2 (1970), 21-22.

McHugh, Rev. James T. (ed.) Working Papers in the Theology of Marriage. Washington: Family Life Bureau, 1967.

Moore, Allen J. "The Relation of Christian Education to Pastoral Theology with Reference to the Function-Centered Theology of Seward Hiltner." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1963.

Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Northrup, F. S. C. The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities. Cleveland: World, 1959.

Oden, Thomas C. Game Free: The Meaning of Intimacy. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Olmsted, Suzanne Allaire. "Emotional Intimacy: A Construct Validation of the Elemental Components of Decreasing Distance Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1974.

Olthuis, James H. I Pledge You My Troth. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

O'Neill, Nena and George. Open Marriage. New York: Evans, 1972.

Orlofsky, Jacob L., James E. Marcia, and Ira M. Lesser. "Ego Identity Status and the Intimacy versus Isolation Crisis of Young Adulthood." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, XXVII: 2 (August 1973), 211-19.

Parsons, Talcot, and Robert F. Bales. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955.

Perls, Frederick S. Ego, Hunger and Aggression. New York: Random House, 1947.

_____. Eyewitness to Therapy. Ben Lomand, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.

_____. The Gestalt Approach. Ben Lomand, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.

_____. Gestalt Therapy Verbatim. Lafayette, CA: Real Peoples Press, 1969.

_____. In and Out of the Garbage Pail. Lafayette, CA: Real Peoples Press, 1969.

_____, Ralph E. Hefferline, and Paul Goodman. Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality. New York: Dell, 1951.

Perutz, Kathrin. Marriage is Hell. New York: Morrow, 1972.

Rapoport, Robert and Rhona. Dual-Career Families. Harmondsworth, Eng: Penguin, 1971.

Richardson, Herbert W. Nun, Witch, Playmate: The Americanization of Sex. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

_____. Toward an American Theology. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

_____, and Donald R. Cutler (eds.) Transcendence. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Ried, John Wallace. "Affiliation and Autonomy Needs as Related to Marital Adjustment of Forty-Three Couples in Central Massachusetts." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1974.

Rubin, Zick. Liking and Loving: An Invitation to Social Behavior. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1970.

Shontz, Franklin C. Research Methods in Personality. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Shostrom, Everett L. Actualizing Therapy: Foundations for a Scientific Ethic. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1976.

_____. Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1974.

Skolnick, Arlene S. The Intimate Environment: Exploring Marriage and the Family. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.

_____. and Jerome H. Family in Transition: Rethinking Marriage, Sexuality, Child Rearing and Family Organization. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

_____. (eds.) Intimacy, Family and Society. Boston: Little, Brown, 1974.

Tillich, Paul. "Conformity." Humanitas, I: 2 (Fall 1965), 117-22.

_____. The Courage To Be. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

_____. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951-63.

To Love and To Cherish: The Marriage Manual of the United Methodist Church. Nashville: Methodist Pub. House, 1970.

Websters' Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged. Springfield, MA: Merriam, 1968.

White, Robert W. Lives in Progress. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1966.

Winter, Gibson. Love and Conflict: New Patterns in Family Life. Garden City: Doubleday, 1958.

Wiseman, Jacqueline P., and Marcia S. Aron. Field Projects in Sociology for Sociology Students. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1970.

Williams, Daniel Day. The Spirit and the Forms of Love. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Yearbook and Directory of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). Indianapolis: General Office of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), 1976.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER SENT TO MINISTERS REQUESTING NAMES OF
PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

INTER-CHURCH COUNSELING SERVICE OF WHITTIER, Inc.
6355 South Greenleaf Avenue
Whittier, California 90601

September 8, 1976

Dear

I'm writing to ask your help in the research I'm doing as a part of my Ph.D. dissertation at the School of Theology at Claremont. I'd like you to send me names, addresses and phone numbers of between five and ten married couples who belong to the church you serve and who you think might be willing to take a pencil-and-paper test, then be interviewed by me.

I'd like the couples tested to be as varied as possible, so a mixture of ages, formal education, types of profession, etc., would be especially helpful.

Since I will introduce myself to the couples by telling them that you gave me their names, I ask that you bear this in mind as you select persons.

Please send the names to me as soon as possible--today if you can. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Ray Akin

P.S. I'll be glad to talk further with you about the research. Just call 698-1918 and leave a message for me. I'll get back to you.

APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT TO PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

INTER-CHURCH COUNSELING SERVICE OF WHITTIER, Inc.
6355 South Greenleaf Avenue
Whittier, California 90601

Ray Akin
Director-Counselor

Telephone
213 / 698-1918

Dear

Your names have been give to me by as persons who might be interested in helping me with research I'm doing in connection with my Ph.D. dissertation in pastoral counseling. The research is in the area of how married couples relate to each other. I'm writing to ask that you take pencil-and-paper tests and then, if I request it, let me interview each of you.

How much time will be involved? Taking the test will take an hour. You can take the test either at 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 28, or at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, October 2. Although each of you must take the test in order for the research to have meaning, you do not have to take it at the same time. In the event that the two of you are selected for interviewing, arrangements would be made for a time and a place that would be mutually convenient. The interview with each of you would last about an hour and a half.

What would you gain from taking part in the research? A profile sheet that is self-explanatory will be mailed to every person who takes the test. From this, and especially from the interviews of those persons who are selected, more learning about self and marriage should result.

Strict confidence will be observed. You will be taking the test in the same room with other people. However, no one other than you, a research associate, and myself will be able to associate your names with the information you give.

I look forward to hearing from you that you will take part in the research. Whether or not you will take part, please return the enclosed post card.

After I receive your card, I'll call you and let you know where to come to take the test.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Ray Akin

Enc.

APPENDIX C

POSTAL CARD ENCLOSED WITH LETTER TO
PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Yes, we'll take part. Put down person(s) for Tuesday night and person(s) for Saturday morning.

No, we don't want to take part.

We'd like to take part but the dates are inconvenient. Let us know if you reschedule the event.

(Signature Optional)

44

Note couple's code written in lower right-hand corner of the card.